

Primitive Christianity
VINDICATED,
IN A
Second LETTER to the Author
of the History of *Montanism*,
AGAINST
The *Arian* Misrepresentations of it,
AND
Mr. WHISTON's bold Assertions in his
late Books.

WITH
An APPENDIX,
Concerning the Incommunicable Name of
God, the *Pre-existing Humanity of Christ*,
the *Mercavah of Ezekiel*; and
several other Matters.

For the further clearing of some Passages in
the First LETTER, against the Exceptions
of the *Postscript* to that Author's *Ac-
count of the Convocation, &c.*

By the Author of the *Considerations on
Mr. Whiston's Historical Preface.*

LONDON: Printed for R. and J. Bonwicks, at
the Red-Lion in St. Paul's Church yard, 1712.

Primitives Christianity

INDICATED

IN A

Second Letter to the Author
of the History of Montanism

AGAINST

The Main Nicene Controversy of 1717

AND

Mr. WHISTLER'S Post Annotations in his
first Book



XIX. A
lone. A
Collection of
Notes on the
History of
Montanism
and the
Primitives.

For this purpose to form a basis for
the History of Montanism and the Primitives
to the reader of this Author's work
and of the other works of
the same period.

By the Author of the Collection of
Notes on the History of Montanism and the Primitives.

London: Printed for A. and J. Bensley, 1717.

to no less than the Evangelical and the Biblical to

the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

and the Evangelical and Biblical Churches of England and elsewhere

Advertisement.

THESE Papers were in my Hands some Time before the Publication of Mr. Whiston's Four Volumes; and were seen by Dr. Grabe, who was pleas'd thereupon to make some Remarks upon the Subject of them, and would himself have taken the Pains to Revise them, but that his Sickness increasing more and more upon him, he was prevented both from that, and from many great and noble Services which, I certainly know, he had design'd for the Benefit of the whole Catholick Church, but more particularly of the Body of the *Lutheran Reformation*, in which he was born; and of the Church of *England*, to which he reckon'd himself yet more nearly ally'd; and therefore had purpos'd to write a Treatise in *Latin* for her Sake, with this Title, *ANGLICANÆ ECCLESIAE Prærogativa præ aliis Protestantium cætibus in Praxis & Doctrina*, together with an Appendix concerning the *Desiderata* which he had observ'd in our Constitution, in order to perfect the *Reformation* of This Church according to the most Primitive Model; whereof a more particular Account may be given in another Place, as well as of some other Matters, which may set the Worth of this Great and Good Man in its just Light, and shew the true Loss which the Church of God and the Learned World have sustain'd, in his being taken from among us in the very

Vigour of his Studies, and the Prosecution of the greatest and most difficult Undertakings.

I shall here only hint at a Remark which he made to me on this Occasion, with a great deal of Pleasure, upon his Sick-Bed, yea, with a more than ordinary Confidence also in God; which was the Confirmation of the common Form of Doxology in the Catholick Church, from the Evidence of St. Paul, as compar'd with, and explain'd by, Himself and of the Writers of the two first Centuries of Christianity, to whom Mr. Whiston so zealously appeals; and for this the Good Doctor especially insisted upon these Words, "Ον τοις αυτοις, καὶ στοιχείοις αὐτοῖς ταῖς τοις αὐτοῖς, Rom. 11. 36. telling me how he had laid a sort of Plan in his Head of a short and plain Discourse in English, for the Use chiefly of the common People (which he said was extremely wanting) to remove from them all those Prejudices, or Scruples, which the Books of Mr. Whiston had rais'd against the Use of this Primitive Form: And then upon the Catholick Tradition of the Object herein Glorify'd [Ἄνθες οὐ Δέξα] which may be found (as he remark'd) even in *Origen* and *Eusebius* themselves, according to *Numb. IV.* and *V.* in the Appendix to this *Second Letter*; but which he chose rather, in short, to deduce from the Apostles thro' *Irenaeus* and *Melito Sardensis*, two unexceptionable Witnesses: for Proof of which, he refer'd, in part, to his Notes upon Dr. *Bull's* *Defensio Fidei*, p. 85 and 86, and had more a great deal to have added as to the latter of these, whom he testify'd an exceeding Veneration for, had he but recover'd from this Sicknes.

For I am well assur'd that he had made large Collections, for about Four or Five and Twenty Years, out of all the Antient Writers, almost

almost after the same Method Mr. Whiston has done; upon the Incarnation of the Logos, and the Doctrine of the Ever-blessed Trinity; and had long consider'd the Allegations on both Sides from the said Testimonies, and the Exceptions and Answers to them, both of one and the other. And the Judgment which he form'd, upon weighing and comparing all these together, was widely different from that which Mr. Whiston has given the World in his *Account of the Primitive Faith*; which will appear by His Remarks upon the same, now to be publish'd, according to his Last Will and Testament. And further, I find this *Memorandum*, relating to the said *Account*, in a loose Paper written with the Doctor's own Hand: *viz.* ' I remember, that Twelve Months ago, when I met him [Mr. Whiston] near St. Paul's Church, in an Alley, and thought not fit to enter into a long Discourse, I told him, that I had to shew most of all the Testimonies of Moment which he hath brought against the Co-essentiality and Eternity of the Son of God, or the *N^og*, from the First Fathers, written down with my own Hand above Twenty Years ago, with Answers to them, and Exceptions against the Answers, and new Answers to the Exceptions; and that yet I had never publish'd any-thing about that Controversy, one way or other (till Occasion was I made some Annotations upon Dr. Bull's excellent *Defensio Fidei*;) as for other Reasons, so for this, that I might better consider of so weighty and so mysterious a Point as this is. And I desired then Mr. Whiston to do the like; and I would now desire that of him again, if he, &c.' Wherewith also agrees what I have met with in another Paper of his, being Part of a *Postscript* which he told me he design'd

Vigour of his Studies, and the Prosecution of the greatest and most difficult Undertakings.

I shall here only hint at a Remark which he made to me on this Occasion, with a great deal of Pleasure, upon his Sick-Bed, yea, with a more than ordinary Confidence also in God; which was the Confirmation of the common Form of Doxology in the Catholick Church, from the Evidence of St. Paul, as compar'd with, and explain'd by, Himself and of the Writers of the two first Centuries of Christianity, to whom Mr. Whiston so zealously appeals; and for this the Good Doctor especially insisted upon these Words, "Ον τοις εγγιας, καὶ τοις εγγιας, καὶ τοις εγγιας ταῖς μητραῖς, αὐτῷ τοις εγγιας ταῖς μητραῖς, Rom. 11. 36. telling me how he had laid a sort of Plan in his Head of a short and plain Discourse in English, for the Use chiefly of the common People (which he said was extremely wanting) to remove from them all those Prejudices, or Scruples, which the Books of Mr. Whiston had rais'd against the Use of this Primitive Form: And then upon the Catholick Tradition of the Object herein Glorify'd [Αὐτῷ οὐ Διξα] which may be found (as he remark'd) even in *Origen* and *Eusebius* themselves, according to *Numb. IV.* and *V.* in the Appendix to this *Second Letter*; but which he chose rather, in short, to deduce from the Apostles thro' *Irenaeus* and *Melito Sardensis*, two unexceptionable Witnesses: for Proof of which, he refer'd, in part, to his Notes upon Dr. *Bull's* *Defensio Fidei*, p. 85 and 86, and had more a great deal to have added as to the latter of these, whom he testify'd an exceeding Veneration for, had he but recover'd from this Sicknes.

For I am well assur'd that he had made large Collections, for about Four or Five and Twenty Years, out of all the Antient Writers, almost

almost after the same Method Mr. Whiston has done; upon the Incarnation of the Logos, and the Doctrine of the Ever-blessed Trinity; and had long consider'd the Allegations on both Sides from the said Testimonies, and the Exceptions and Answers to them, both of one and the other. And the Judgment which he form'd, upon weighing and comparing all these together, was widely different from that which Mr. Whiston has given the World in his *Account of the Primitive Faith*; which will appear by His Remarks upon the same, now to be publish'd, according to his Last Will and Testament. And further, I find this *Memorandum*, relating to the said *Account*, in a loose Paper written with the Doctor's own Hand: viz. 'I remember, that Twelve Months ago, when I met him [Mr. Whiston] near St. Paul's Church, in an Alley, and thought not fit to enter into a long Discourse, I told him, that I had to shew most of all the Testimonies of Moment which he hath brought against the Co-essentiality and Eternity of the Son of God, or the *Logos*, from the First Fathers, written down with my own Hand above Twenty Years ago, with Answers to them, and Exceptions against the Answers, and new Answers to the Exceptions; and that yet I had never publish'd any-thing about that Controversy, one way or other (till Occasion was I made some Annotations upon Dr. Bull's excellent *Defensio Fidei*;) as for other Reasons, so for this, that I might better consider of so weighty and so mysterious a Point as this is. And I desired then Mr. Whiston to do the like; and I would now desire that of him again, if he, &c.' Wherewith also agrees what I have met with in another Paper of his, being Part of a *Postscript* which he told me he design'd

design'd should follow his *Essay* upon two *Antient Manuscripts*. Where, iafter having spoken of certain Superstitious and Idolatrous Practices in the Church of *Rome*, as no Objection against the Principles of our common Salvation by them and us maintain'd; he makes this following Declaration. I am perswaded that the Church of *Rome*, with most of the other Churches of the World, hath made her self, in these latter Times, guilty of the Crime of Idolatry, and gross Superstitions, which, and other Errors in their Profession and Worship, ever hinder'd me from going over to their Communion. Nevertheless, if I should write about these Matters, (or, rather, publish what I have written above 15 or 16 Years ago, after much Reading and impartial Consideration, and having so often thought thereof since, by Occasion of some Persons, who, inclining to Popery, I was desired to dissuade them from it, by discoursing with them) I should, for fear of being mistaken, as a Man, hardly, at least in some Points, write with such Assurance and Defiance as Mr. *Whiston* doth about the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, and some other Points relating thereunto, which yet, by his own Confession, he hath study'd but these Three Years. Thus far He. I heartily wish the Modesty of this great Christian Antiquary were imitated by all that write for or against this Mystery of our Faith. I am sure there is the greatest Reason for our being modest in Researches of this Nature, so infinitely above us. It is the Misfortune, besides, of many to run away with one Part of the Question, and to drop the other: And thus have Heresies been propagated from the Beginning; and thus it is even at this Day: Whereas the whole State of the Question must be thoroughly understood, before

before a right Judgment can be form'd thereupon. This was the Method that was taken by that late excellent Person, as appears by the prodigious Pains he took in Examining all the Controversies which divide the Christian World at this Day: And it is the Method of the Learned and Pious Author of the *Considerations*, for whom he express'd, a little before his Death, a very particular Esteem; as will appear both from this *Letter*, and from the *Appendix* that is annex'd.

How well the Author has here acquitted himself in these farther *Considerations*, in the Vindication of what (after all that Mr. *Whiston* has publish'd) he still takes to be the genuine Primitive Faith, let the Reader judge impartially. If some Things be here advanced, which may want perhaps a fuller clearing up, or at least for some Readers, that may be done hereafter. I have no more to say; but let the Fate of the *Eastern Empire*, and the Breaking out of the *Saracenick Sect*, be at this Time remember'd by all that are any-wise engaged in this Controversy: And let us take heed, as we shall answer it to God, that no Advantage be given to the Common Enemy.

I know it is expected that I should say something to Mr. *Whiston*, so far as I am more immediately concern'd with him, I having been so signally obliged to him for the Notice he has taken of my *Premonition*, and of a few *Plain Questions* that were put to him in Return for those celebrated ones of His in his *Historical Preface*: But I have neither Inclination nor Leisure now to enter upon a Task of this Nature, whereof I could promise my self no End. Much rather would I desire to prosecute another Design, which was suggested to me, upon his Death-Bed, by my Friend and Brother Dr. *Grabe*, and which he made a Vow also to perform (if it had pleased

God

God to restore him to the Church) laying aside, for the Time, all other Studies whatsoever! And nothing, truly, lies so deep at my Heart (and, I think, ought to lie so at the Heart of every Christian) as to endeavour, by all Means, the **Peace and Unity of the Church, upon the Foundation which Christ and his Apostles have laid.**

CONTENTS of the LETTER.

- I. **T**hat JEHOVAH is the Incommunicable Name of GOD, expressing Him as He is Being, page 1
- II. **T**hat CHRIST had a Real Existence, as of a distinct active Being, before his Coming forth to create the World, p. 25
- III. **T**hat at his Incarnation, he assum'd a Rational Soul, like to other Men. p. 40
- IV. **T**hat the Holy Ghost is really and truly GOD; and, consequently, the Object of Invocation, p. 61

Of the APPENDIX.

- I. **T**hat the True God has an Incommunicable Name Known to Man, p. 82
- II. **T**he Divine and Pre-existing Humanity of Christ, p. 85
- III. **T**he same prov'd by the Existence of the Merca-
vah, before the World, p. 89
- IV. **A**n Extract out of Eusebius, concerning the Crea-
tion of Wisdom, p. 95
- V. **T**he Doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as taught by Origen in his Book against Celsus, p. 100
- VI. **A**n Argument for the Divinity and Worship of the H. Ghost, from the Practice of the first Christian Prophets, and infallibly Inspired Teachers, p. 109

SIR,

as and before the time of Christ, but in the
middle of the world, and in the

SIR,

IN order to support the Doctrine of the Considerations in relation to three or four great Truths of Moment, which particularly strike at the *Arian* Scheme, such as that *Jehovah* is the incommunicable Name of God, expressing Him as He is Being; that the Son had a real Existence as of a distinct active Being before his *Creation*, or coming forth to make the World; that He assum'd a Humane or Rational Soul besides the Body; and that the Holy Ghost is really and truly God and the Object of our Worship, I venture to trouble you with this Second Letter. I am sensible there is no End of Disputes of this Nature, where both Parties view the Authors referr'd to in different Lights; and that All that can be done on this occasion, is to shew the Grounds of our Faith and Practice in the Writings proper to decide the Controversie, and leave the pious and honest Reader to judge for himself under the Light and Direction of God's Holy Spirit, which he ought earnestly to desire for this Purpose. This therefore I shall endeavour to do in as few Words as possible, taking in such Truths

as depend upon and are related to those above-mention'd, and obviating such Objections as may be made against them.

First then, I shall prove that *Jehovah* is the Name of God expressing Him as He is Being.

And that this Name is Incommunicable.

The Truth of the First has been already prov'd from Scripture in the Appendix to the Considerations, p. 101, 2, where it has been shewn, that the Name *Jehovah* is of the same Importance with *I am*, or according to the Septuagint Translation, (a) *He who is*, which expresseth God as *Being it self*, or the Necessary and Eternal *Being*, so far as it can be comprehended by Humane Mind. In which Sense it is understood both by the Antient and Modern Jews and Christians. *Philo* interprets it in this Meaning, tho' he denies any proper Name to the Unknown and Incomprehensible Essence of God, which is undoubtedly true. His Words are these, (b) *Say to them, saith God, that I am Being, that they learning the Difference between Being and No Being may be instructed, that No Name can in any wise be properly spoken of me, to whom only it belongs to Be.* And again, p. 184. he says,

(a) 'Ο ὁν Exod. 3. 14.

(b) *De vita Mos.* p. 614. Edit. Par. 1640. Λέγει φαντάνεται, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὁν. Ινα μαδονής μαρορεύν οὐτούς καὶ οὐτούς περι-
αναστάχθων, ὡς ἀδεύ ὄντα επ' ἐμοῦ τὸ φρέσκαν κινητον
γῆν, ἡ μόνη περίστι τὸ εἶ.

(a) *God*

(a) God only essentially is, therefore He necessarily says of Himself, I am Being; as if the Things after Him were not Beings essentially, but only esteem'd to subsist in the Opinion of Men. Maimonides says the same, explaining I am that I am, thus, (b) He who necessarily Exists. The Antient Christians understand it of God, as He is Eternal Being. So Chrysostome on St. John; The Term I am, says he, (c) signifies that which always is, and has no Beginning, and that truly and properly is. So Justin Martyr, (d) God willing to teach Moses, his Eternity, said I am that I am; the Term Being signifying not one Portion of Duration only, but the whole Three, the Past, Present, and to Come. Novatian in his Book de Trinitate, c. 4. makes it to signify that which is Eternal and Immutable. So that it is evident that both the Jews and Antient Doctors of the Christian Church understood I am to mean God, as He is the One Neces-

(a) ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς μόνος ἐν τῷ ἐώντι ἀφέσκεται, καὶ χάριν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἐργοῦ τῷ αὐτῷ, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὄν, ὡς τοῦ μετ' αὐτὸν καὶ ὅντα τὸ ἐώντα, δοξῇ τῷ μόνῳ ὑφεστάνται νομιζούσιθων.

(b) More Nevochim, p. 114. See also Menasseh Ben Israel Concil. Quæst. 3. in Exod.

(c) Τὸν δὲ ὁ ὄν, τὸν αὐτὸν τὸν σημαντικόν ὅσιον, καὶ τὸν αὐτούρχον τὸν, καὶ τὸν δύναμιν τὸν καὶ πολεμον. Edit. Sav. Tom. 2. p. 614.

(d) Τὸν αἰδιότητα αὐτὸν δὲ Θεὸς τῷ Μενοῦ σημιῆναι δέλων, Ἐγώ εἰμι δὲ ὄν, ἔστι, τὸ ὄν συλλαβθῆς ἐκ ἔναντος μόνον συλέσσοντος, ἀλλα τρεῖς τὸ παρελπούσθοτα, τὸ ἐνεσῶτα, καὶ τὸ μέλλοντα. Edit. Steph. R. 23. See also Clem. Alex. Paedag. p. 118. Edit. Par. 1629. Basil. cont. Eunom. lib. 2. p. 56. D. Ambro. Comment. ad Psal. 43. Hieron. in Jerem. c. 23. p. 303. Edit. Ant. & in cap. 3. Epist. ad Ephes. Theodoret. Quæst. 1. in Genes. p. 3.

sary, Eternal, and Immutable Being. Of the modern Criticks no doubt can be made by those who have read them. If then *Jehovah* be of the same Meaning with *I am*, as is affirm'd both by Jews and (a) Christians, who have treated of the Name, and is evident from *Exod. 3. 14, 15.* where *Jehovah* is substituted in the place of it, then does *Jehovah* stand for God, as He is the Necessary, Eternal, and Immutable Being. *Maimonides* may speak for all the Jews before Him, whose great Learning cou'd not let him be Ignorant of the true and traditional Interpretation of the Name *Jehovah*; *It teaches us*, says he, (b) *concerning the Substance of God clearly and without any Equivocation.* Having then this great Cloud of Witnesses, I am the more surpris'd that the Author of the *Postscript* shou'd not in his Observation of the Scripture Dialect (c) discern that, which has been obvious to others for so many Ages, *that the Name Jehovah relates to the Substance of God.* If indeed He means God's Essence as it is Infinite and Incomprehensible, no Body will contend it with Him: But if he means his Substance so far as it may be comprehended under the Notion of Being, which is All that is asserted

(a) *Theodorit. Quæs. 15. in Exod. Ainsworth. &c.*

(b) *More Nevoch. p. 106. See also Menass. Ben Israel Con-*

cil. Quæs. 3. and Buxtorf on the Name JEHOVAH.

(c) *Postscript, p. 71.*

in the Considerations, p. 104. It may be true that He cou'd not observe it in Scripture, but not so true that it was not to be found there.

The next Thing I shall prove is, that the Name *Jehovah* is *Incommunicable*. For if it means Necessary and Eternal Being, or Being it self, and Nothing be such but the One God, then can it not be given to any but the One God. This Truth is confirm'd by two eminent and learned Fathers of the Antient Church. *Origen* and *Eusebius*, the former of whom has these Words, (a) *This God therefore of Israel, the one God and Creator of all Things, is Written with certain Characters or Letters, which the Jews call the Tetragrammaton. Whensover therefore God is written with these Characters in Scripture, there is no doubt but they must be understood of the True God and Creator of the World.* It is evident that this learned Father knew not one Instance in Scripture, in which the *Tetragrammaton* was not understood of the True God and Creator; And his speaking of it as an undoubted Truth, argues it was the general Opinion of the learned Christians of his Time, and that either those

(a) See *Hom. 14. upon Numbers*, p. 141. C. *Iste ergo Deus Israel, Deus unus & Creator omnium, certo quodam literarum signo scribitur, quod apud illos Tetragrammaton dicitur, si quando ergo sub hoc signo in Scripturis scribitur Deus, nulla est dubitatio quin de Deo vero & mundi Creatore dicatur.* The like is affirmed by the Learned *Hierom of JAH*, the Contraction of *Jehovah*, that is used of God alone, *Quod in Deo tantum pernitur, Epist. 136.*

Antient Christians read the Sacred Books in a different Spirit from Mr. *Whiston*, or that he must have met with Helps, which those earlier Ages were not acquainted with. Nay shou'd the above-cited Passage be *Ruffinus's* and not *Origen's*, yet wou'd it be an ample Testimony of the Opinion of the Church in the fourth and fifth Centuries.

The next Authority is taken out of *Euseb.* *Demonstrat.* *Evang.* lib. 9. p. 435. Edit. Par, which shews us the Opinion of the Ancient Jews, as the former did of the Antient Christians: For, speaking of the Term *Lord* us'd of Christ, *Psalm* 91. 9. he says thus, (a) *The Term Lord is express'd in the Hebrew by the Tetragrammaton, which the Jews say is unutterable, and which they are accustomed to apply to God only.* Notwithstanding these Authorities, the *Postscript* tells us, p. 71, that the Doctrine of the incommunicable Name is built on an ungrounded Tradition, or superstitious Fancy of the Jews. It is strange that the learned and sagacious *Origen*, or his Interpreter *Ruffinus*, with the Christians of his Time, should not discern this; or that the Ancient Jews, whose Posterity maintain the contrary, in Opposition to the Christians, should univerfally hold a Doctrine so favoura-

(a) Τὸ Κύει, διὰ τὸ τελεγυεόμενον ὄνοματον ἐν τῷ Εβραικῷ φέρεται, ὅπερ ἀνεκδιδυτον εἴ τοι λέγοντες Εβραῖοι προστίθει, διὰ μόνη τὸ Θεῖον τοῦδε λαμβάνεται εἰδώδαιον.

ble to the Christians, and the Divinity of the *Messiah*, which they then deny'd, had they not undoubtedly receiv'd it from the Writings and Traditions of their Fore-fathers. This Doctrine of the incommunicable Name is so plainly contained in Scripture, *Exod. 3. 15.* (a), which asserts *Jehovah* to be God's Name for ever, and his *Memorial unto all Generations*; and the contrary so flatly contradicts Scripture, so prevents the Design of its being a *Memorial* of the One True God, by communicating it to another, and brings such insuperable Confusion into the Object of our Faith and Worship, that I think nothing but the great Prejudice of the later *Jews* against Christianity, could make them advance and maintain it against the Tradition of their Ancestors, and the plain Doctrine of Scripture; nor any-thing but some spurious unfound Writings, put the Author of the *Postscript* upon siding with them.

10 If then *Jehovah* be an *incommunicable* Name appropriated to the True God, and the Son be call'd *Jehovah*, as is confess'd on both Sides, then is the Son with the Father the True God. *Eusebius*, for whom Mr. *Whiston* declares so high an Esteem, was so persuaded of the Force of this Reasoning, that he owns himself to have us'd it in proving the Divinity of the Son; for having shewn in

(a) See Appendix to the *Considerations*, p. 104.

the Passage above-cited, the Jewish Notion of the Importance of this Name, and that they apply'd it solely to the True God, he immediately subjoyns, (a) *And we also have shewn before, that it is used in many Places of Scripture to express the Divinity of the Word;* that is, he had prov'd the Word to be God, from the Name *Jehovah* or *Lord* attributed to him; which would have been no Argument, had he not been of the same Opinion with the *Jews*, that it was proper to the True God only, and not communicable to another; or had the Son only personated the *Supream God*, and spoken in his Name, when he called himself *Jehovah*, as the *Postscript* affirms, p. 72. which is look'd upon there to be so peculiar a Case, without the Possibility of a Parallel, and not to be known without Revelation, that it is no wonder the Apostolical Constitutions or *New Scripture* must be publish'd to the World to make this Discovery, which could not be gained out of the Doctrines of the *Old*. Is it possible that this Author's Notion should be true, and yet nothing certain deliver'd in the undoubted Writings of the Old and New Testament to inform us of it, or conduct us right in the Object of our Worship, impossible to be known without such a Revelation? Can it be suppos'd that the *Jews*

(a) Ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ ὡς τὸν λόγον θεόν τον οὐ πλεῖστον κείμενον γεράπεπλον ξαμψόν.

were

were left to the Uncertainty of Tradition in this great Article ? or that the true Key to this Religious Secret, so necessary to be had by all faithful Worshippers, should in After-times, when God reveal'd his Mind with the greatest Evidence, be confin'd to a Volume that was to lie Concealed in the Hands of the Bishops ? These are strange Considerations ; and will not easily be admitted without a greater Authority to enforce them, than what has yet been produced. In the mean time it becomes us to believe with our Fathers, and own that Christ is Lord or *Jehovah*, as the Name stands for a Necessary and Eternal Being ; in which Sense it is *Univocally* taken of both Persons, notwithstanding the Subordination to, and Dependency of the Son upon the Father, and the Objection (a) made to it upon that Account. I shall choose to argue from earthly Beings ; for if these can be dependent and independent, subordinate and superiour, and yet Univocal ; it may be a bold thing to deny the like of Heav'nly Subsistences in a way and manner agreeable to their Perfection. As for instance, a Son is subordinate to his Father, yet the Nature is the same in both Persons, and the Term Man, which expresses it, Univocal. A Child un-born has a Substantial Dependence on its Mother, yet is it of the same Nature and Denomination with her, *a reasonable Creature*.

(a) Postscript, p. 66, 67.

The Son then, being in an Univocal Sense *Jehovah*, is consubstantial with the Father, God by Nature, and One with Him, as being the same Necessary and Eternal Being with the Father, not Personally, but Substantially. This Truth has been asserted by the Ante-Nicene Fathers according to the Testimony of *Eusebius* in his (a) Letter to his Clergy; and by no less than about Three hundred and eighteen Fathers in the Council of *Nice*, who Taught and Subscribed to the Consubstantiality of the Son; the Major Part of whom may be fairly suppos'd to have brought their Opinions along with them, and not to have receiv'd 'em from some leading Men who influenced the Council; and therefore to have learn'd them from their Forefathers by a traditional Descent in the several Churches they were first instructed in; and in this respect may be looked upon as Witnesses of the Truth before ever they declared themselves publickly in Council. I say all this may be fairly suppos'd, till the pretended Errours of these Fathers, and the Occasions of them be as clearly made out, as the gross and unhappy Mistakes of some later Councils. Till this can be done, these are such a Cloud of Witnesses, as are not to be Balanced by the few Testimonies of some single Fathers; who probably had no Occasion of declaring themselves

(a) *Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. cap. 8.*

accurately

accurately in such a Controversy, and who may have treated of the Son with more Regard to his Love and Condescension to the Creature, than his natural Excellency; and may be ill understood in what they well design'd for exciting the Gratitude and Affection of their Readers.

That He is *God by Nature*, is suppos'd in Scripture, when it allows of the Worship paid to the Son, and yet condemns that which is given those who are *not Gods by Nature*, Galat. 4. 8. It is asserted also by *Eusebius* himself, in express Terms, in his *Demonst. Evang.* p. 227. Edit. *Paris.* where speaking of the Son, he says, (a) *That he is both God by Nature, and also the only begotten Son.* *Origen* tells us, (b) *That the only begotten Son alone was from the Beginning Son by Nature;* which supposes him to be God by Nature, as the natural Son of a Man is by Nature Man. And from this very Principle of a natural Filiation, does *Eusebius* in the same Place infer the Son's Divinity, saying, (c) *And all this may be the Reason why he also is God, because He only is Son of God by Nature, &c.* If Son and God by Nature, then has he a natural Right to Worship, found-

(a) Καὶ φύσες Θεός ὅμοιος καὶ μορογενής ψός ὡς τοιχάρες.

(b) Μονὸς τὸ μορογενὲς φύσεις καὶ αὐτῆς τυχάνοντος. *Comment. in Joann.* p. 56.

(c) Καὶ ὅλον γε τὸν αἴπον ἀπὸ αὐτῆς καὶ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ Θεὸν, τὸ μέρος ἐπὶ φύσεις τὸ Θεῖον καὶ τοιχάρες, &c.

ed in his Godhead or Divine Nature ; so that tho' the Father is not excluded out of the Worship of the Son, and the Worship of the Son finally terminates in the Worship of the Father, yet is not the Son worshipped barely on the Father's Account, or as the Father's (*a*) Vicegerent, but in regard also of his own Essential Excellency. The *Postscript*, indeed, p. 80. in Answer to the Fourth plain Question, would have us believe that He is God by *Appointment*, *Constitution*, or *Creation*, and brings in *Eusebius* as saying, *He receiv'd his Divinity from the Father*. But what then ? Must he needs have receiv'd it by *Creation* or *Constitution*, and not *Eternal Generation* ? Surely, whether we consider the Son as begotten of the Father from all Eternity, or whether we consider him as voluntarily coming forth in order to *Creation*, it is necessary that with his Personal Subsistence he receive the Divinity of his Person also from God the Father. And therefore the Church, who confesses him to be *very God of very God*, never thought it self chargeable with a Contradiction, for believing him to be such by *Eternal Generation*. It cites also *Acts* 2. 36, and a Passage out of *Lactantius* to the same Purpose, and asserts that *the Son was never called God, till after his Resurrection and Exaltation to the Right-hand of his Father*. I shall

(*a*) *Postscript*, p. 83.

consider them in Order : And first the Passage out of the *Acts*, *That God has made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ*; which, if it be well apply'd by the Author of the *Postscript*, must signify these two Things, that the Son of God is made Lord ; and, that he was not such till after his Sufferings. That he is not a made Lord, but Lord by Nature, is evident from his being God *Jehovah*, or the One Necessary and Eternal Being, in Union with the Father. And that he was Lord and Christ before his Sufferings is evident, as from many Passages of the Sacred Writings, so especially from *Luke 2. 11.* where he is call'd *Christ the Lord* from his very Birth. What then can the Meaning of the Text be ? Not that the Son was not Lord in respect of his Divinity, or Christ in respect of his Humanity, before his Sufferings ; but that he was more eminently declared so both to Men and Angels, when he had finished his Ministry, by his Exaltation to God's Right-hand in his Human Nature, and his being placed in a full and calm Enjoyment of the Blessings of the Kingdom, and those Honours and Prerogatives which he had been vigorously struggling for in his frail Humanity under the Labours of the Cross. For if Christ, who was always the Son of God, was more particularly call'd so in respect of his Resurrection, *Acts 13. 33. Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*, because

he

he was declared or demonstrated to be the Son of God, by that surprizing Act of Divine Power in raising him from the Dead ; shall we not say that He who was always Lord and Christ, was made or declar'd more especially such by the same Resurrection ? *Rom. 1. 4.* And on this account 'tis that *Thomas* calls Christ, *(a) my Lord and my God* : Tho' He was always God, as being the Word, *John 1. 1.* After the like manner is *Phil. 2. 9.* to be interpreted, *Wherfore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every Name*, that is, as the Word of God was given to the Humanity of Christ from the Beginning in the way of Patience, to conduct it thro' the Cross, so was it communicated at the Resurrection in a new, quickening, and triumphant Manner to exalt the Man, who had already suffered, to the Height of Glory above any Creature. For that the *Word* is the Son's Name, is evident from *Rev. 19. 13.* and that the *Word* is above *ev'ry Name*, from *Psalm 138. 2.* What Name then cou'd the Humanity receive at its Exaltation but the *Word*, communicated to it in its utmost Splendour ? Which the Son calls his *new Name*, *Rev. 3. 12.* because not known to the Humanity in this *new* Property till after His Sufferings.

(a) See *Psalm 35. 23. 24.* *both in the Hebrew and the Septuagint.*

As for *Lactantius*, He calls him God while he was yet on Earth, and before his Death, and applies to him *Baruch* 3. 37. that *God shew'd himself upon the Earth; and Convers'd with Men.* It will also be granted according to *John* 10. 36. that the Humanity was sanctify'd by *the Word, and sent into the World,* and the *whole Person* on that account call'd God; but it does not prove that the Word it self was *God by Appointment, and not by Nature.*

From the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, and his being God by Nature, will follow his Unity; otherwise there wou'd be more Gods than one, as appears from *John* 10. 30. *I and my Father are One,* which is understood of a substantial (a) Unity, and is Paraphrased thus by *Novatian de Trinit.* c. 23. (b) *How can that Saying be true, I and my Father are one, if he is not both God and Son?* (that is, Son, as He calls him *Father*; God,

(a) *Tertull. adv. Prax.* c. 25.

(b) *Quomodo enim Ego & Pater unum sumus, si non & est Deus & Filius? Qui idcirco unum potest dici, dum ex ipso est, & dum Filius ejus est, & dum ex ipso nascitur, dum ex ipso processisse reperitur, per quod & Deus est. Quod cum inuidiosum putassent Iudei, & blasphemum credidissent, eo quod se ostenderat his sermonibus Christum esse Deum, ac propterea ad lapides concurrissent, & saxonum iictus injicere gestassent, exemplo & testimonio Scripturarum adversarios suos fortiter refutavit: si illos, inquit, dixit Deos, ad quos verba facta sunt, & non potest solvi Scriptura, quem Pater sanctificavit, & misit in hunc mundum, vos dicitis, quia blasphemas, quia dixi, Filius Dei sum ego. Quibus vocibus neq; se negavit Deum, quin immo Deum se esse firmavit.*

as he affirms himself to be one with Him.) Who therefore may be said to be one with the Father, because he is of the Father, his Son, Born of Him, and is found to have proceeded from Him (which is opposed to being made in this Chapter) on which account he is God also. And because the Jews were offended at this Saying, and held him for a Blasphemer, because he had declared himself by these Words to be Christ the God, and wou'd have ston'd him for it, he forcibly confutes them with Scripture Authority, saying, if it calls them Gods to whom the Word comes, and the Scripture cannot be broken, say ye of him whom the Father has Sanctified and sent into the World, thou Blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God. In which Words he did not deny himself to be God, but rather confirm'd it, that He was such. In which Passage the following Truths may be observed: That the Unity meant by Christ, when he says, I and my Father are One, is an Unity of Godhead or the Divine Nature: That this Unity is founded in the Sonship, or his being begotten of the Father: That the Jews understood him in this exalted Sense, and therefore wou'd have stoned him, because he made himself Christ the God: (which shews this Father's Opinion that the Jews looked upon their Messiah to be the true God.) And that Christ did not deny their Charge, but justified himself to be God.

I have

I have been the larger on this Citation, to shew that the Extract out of St. *John's* Gospel concerning the Jewish Notion of the Messiah in our Saviour's Time, in the Appendix to the Considerations, contains in it no single and new Doctrine, but what is so clearly taught in Scripture, that an Antient Writer, and even a supposed Friend to the *Arian* Cause cou'd not but confirm it. Nay, he tells us *ch. 25.* that *John* and other Writers are conceiv'd to have taken all they have said concerning the Word from *Moses*; and that it is according to the Doctrine of the Old and New Testament, that the Church believes and holds Jesus Christ to be both God and Man. Cou'd then the Divinity of the Messiah be so plain in *Moses*, and yet the Jewish Nation in St. *John's* Time be generally unacquainted with it? Or rather may not the contrary be inferr'd from the Manner of the Reasoning of the Author to the *Hebrews*? It is worthy to be observed, that *Novatian* does not speak this as his own private Opinion, that St. *John* had his Doctrine of the Divinity of the Word from the Old Testament, but says it Indefinitely, as if currently believ'd by others as well as himself.

There is indeed one Difficulty started against it, taken from our Saviour's Question *Matth. 22. 42,----46.* which I am of Opinion the *Postscript* puts wrong, *p. 105.* as if the meaning of our Saviour's Question had been, *how Christ who was to be the Son of David, cou'd*

D be

be call'd his *Lord*? When it seems to have been quite contrary, how Christ whom *David* calls *Lord*, cou'd be his *Son*? For so does he conclude the whole *Questioning*, v. 45. If *David* then call him *Lord*, how is he his *Son*? Which lays the Stress of the *Question*, not upon *David's* *Son* being *David's* *Lord*, but upon *David's* *Lord* becoming *David's* *Son*; that is, it relates to the *Mystery* of the *Incarnation*; how so Excellent and Divine a Person as the *Messiah*, the *Son of God*, and *God himself*, and *David's* *Lord*, cou'd become his *Son*. Which it is no wonder the *Jews* cou'd not answer, tho' they held both *Parts* of the *Question*, that he was *David's* *Lord* and *Son*; since the *Incarnation* of the *Word* is at this *Day* a great *Mystery* to all *Christians*, and rather to be believ'd and admir'd than attempted to be explain'd. And therefore their *Incapacity* to answer so difficult a *Question*, proves rather their *Opinion* of the *Excellency* of their *Messiah* than the contrary; since they knew not how to reconcile so much *Greatness* with so much *Humility*. Christ indeed, v. 43. asks, *How David in Spirit calls him Lord*; but this was rather a *Difficulty* started upon the *main Question*, which they had already answered, v. 42. than the *main Question* it self; that being put in mind of the *Dignity* of their *Messiah*, they might be the more perplexed to give a reasonable *Answer* of his becoming *Man*; which was the *principal Question*, v. 45. and

and by which he silenc'd them from troubling him ever after with their ensnaring Questions.

It wou'd be needless to deduce and review the particular Attributes which necessarily belong to the Son as God. I shall only take notice of some of them, to the Proof of which the Author of the *Postscript* has particularly objected ; speaking first two or three Words in Defence of the Method made use of in the Considerations to answer the plain Questions. It is his Opinion p. 76. that no proper Answer has been made to the three first Questions, because it has not been prov'd, that the Terms are so placed and united in Scripture, as they are in his Questions : That is, no proper Answer can be given to his Question, *Where are the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost called one God*, except an affirmative Proposition be brought out of Scripture, consisting of the same Number and Order of Terms with his, as thus, *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one God*. Now I think any one may see that it wou'd be no difficult Thing after this manner for a cunning Man so to propose his Questions, as to be capable of evading a great Part of revealed Truth: As for instance, if it shou'd be ask'd, where is it in direct and express Terms said in Scripture, that *Christ descended into Hell*, or *that there is a Holy Catholick Church*. And yet, notwithstanding these Truths cannot be shew'd in express Terms, our Fa-

thers thought that plain Inference and certain Tradition were a sufficient Ground to insert them into the Creed. Nay, Mr. *Whiston* himself must necessarily depart from his *Arian Scheme*, if he will hold nothing, but what may be proved in the very Terms, he may be question'd about them : as I am pretty confident will appear from his Answers to the plain Questions, which will not be found to be made always with that Exactness of Terms, which the Questions require ; which he demands himself in his plain Questions, and for the Defect of which he flights the *Considerations*.

These unreasonable and impracticable Demands wou'd almost make a Man judge, who was not well perswaded of the Author's Integrity, that the Questions were so framed on purpose, that the Conviction might be avoided, which wou'd otherwise arise from Comparing and Reasoning. For it appears to me very strange, that when the Son is proved to be *God* in one Place, and *Him who lives*; or the *Living One*, in another, in the proper and emphatical Sense of the Words, and there is but *One God*, yet he should be deny'd in the Conclusion to be the *Living God* †, because these two Terms perhaps are not unitedly affirm'd of him with that Evidence in

† Clem. Alexand. Admon. ad gent. p. 66. Edit. Paris. Πί. στιον αρθρωπ τῷ πανόντι, καὶ περσικημένῳ Θεῷ ζῶντι.

the Sacred Writings, as some single Persons may injudiciously require. For the Principle of Reasoning is very evident, that *He who lives, and is God*, in the Sense abovemention'd, is *the Living God*; except the Revivers of *Arianism* introduce *Polytheism*, and assert a Plurality of Living Gods; and then, indeed, *He who lives and is God*, is not *the Living God*, but *a Living God*. However, after all, it may be, that the *Arian Scheme* has a Method of Reasoning peculiar to it self, as well as a Rule of Faith and Worship.

But to proceed to the Attributes and Titles, whose Proofs he objects against, I shall begin with that of the *True God*; which he affirms, *Postscript p. 107.* to belong to the Father, exclusive of the Son; because it is said *John 17. 3. That they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* In Answer to which, I shall observe, *First*, That the *Nicene Fathers*, who probably knew and understood this Text as well as Mr. *Whiston*, do affirm the *Son*, notwithstanding the exclusive Term *only*, to be *very (a) God of very God*. Which is an Argument they did not look upon it as intended by our Saviour, to exclude himself, as to his Divine Nature. *Secondly*, That the Term *Only (b)* is not us'd in Opposition to the Divi-

(a) Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν εἰν Θεοῖς ἀληθινοῖς.

(b) See *Tertull. adv. Prax.* c. 18, 19.

nity of the Son, but to False Gods ; as I have already shewn in the Appendix to the *Considerations*, p. 84, &c. and which I shall further confirm. For if the Term (*a*) *Alone* does not exclude the Father when apply'd to the Son, why should it exclude the Son when apply'd to the Father ? since the Father is no more without the Son, than the Son without the Father. *Clemens Alexand.* *ad Gentes*, p. 66. says thus of Christ, (*b*) *O all Men believe him who is the only God of all Men* ; but surely he did not design to exclude the Father. And our Saviour, *John* 16. 32, tells his Disciples that they should leave him *alone* (*c*), but however adds, *Yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me*, to teach us, that tho' all others were excluded by that Expression, yet the Father was not. Just so on the other Side, at the Beginning of the next Chapter, does he say, *This is the eternal Life, that they may know thee the only true God* (*d*), yet immediately addeth, *And Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent* ; as it seems, to teach us, that the Term *Only*, or *Alone*, no more excludes the Son here, than it had done the Father before. *Novatian de Trin.* lib. 24. con-

(*a*) Μόνος.(*b*) Πάντες ἀνθρώποις πιεύσατε μονῷ τῷ πάντων ἀνθρώπων Θεῷ.(*c*) Μόνον.(*d*) Τὸν μόνον αὐτὸν, &c.

firms this Truth, For, says he, (a) if Christ would not have been thought God, why did he add, And Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, except he had a mind to be accounted God? — But he join'd himself with God, that by this Union he might be known to be God, as really he is. We must therefore believe, according to the foregoing Rule, in the Lord, the Only True God, and, by consequence, in Jesus Christ whom he sent; who wou'd never, as we have said, have join'd himself with the Father, except he had been willing they should have believed him to have been God.

This Interpretation comprehending the Son under the Only True God, is follow'd by other Fathers. (b) Again, the True God is affirm'd to be *Eternal Life*, or an *Eternal Quickning Essence*, *1 John 5. 20*. Scripture and Reason have discover'd to us no more than one *Eternal Life* or *Quickning Essence*; if then the True God be this one *Eternal Life* or *Quickning Essence*, then, *vice versa*, will this one *Eternal Life* or *Quickning Essence* be the *True God*; and Jesus Christ,

(a) *Si noluisset se etiam Deum intelligi, cur addidit, Et quem misisti, Jesum Christum, nisi quoniam & Deum accipi voluit.* — *Sed Deo junxit, ut & Deum per hanc conjunctionem, sic ut est, intelligi vellet.* *Est ergo credendum secundum prescriptam regulam in Dominum unum verum Deum, & in eum, quem misit Jesum Christum consequenter; qui se nequam Patri, ut diximus, junxit, nisi Deum quoque intelligi vellet.*

(b) See also *Considerations*, Paragr. 21.

who

who is this one *Eternal Life* or *Quickning Essence*, 1 John 1. 2. will be the *True God*.

The next Attribute I shall consider, is the *Omnipotency*, which may be further prov'd to belong to Christ by the following Authorities. *Theophil. ad Autol.* p. 13. gives us the Definition of *Almighty* in the following Terms, (a) *He who presides over all Things, and comprehends them within himself.* Which he proves to be true of God, by enumerating the several Parts of the Creation, that depend upon Him as their Creator and Preserver, *so that his Greatness is known and understood by his Works.* But all this is strictly true of the Son, who, in Union with the Father, *made the Worlds, and upholds all Things by the Word of his Power,* Heb. 1. 2, 3. therefore is He strictly and truly Almighty. *Tertullian* says, That the Son is (b) *God Almighty in his own Right, both as he is the Word of God Almighty, and as he has receiv'd Power over all Things.* *Eusebius* also tells us from *Zach.* 2. 8, 9. that there are two who are call'd (c) *Lord Almighty; one who sends, namely the Father, and the other who is sent, namely the Son.*

(a) Παντοκράτωρ ἢ ὅπις αὐτὸς τὰ πάντα κρέται καὶ ἐμπειρίχει.

(b) *Adv. Prax.* c. 17. *Suo jure Deus Omnipotens, quia Sermo Dei omnipotentis, quāque omnium accepit potestatem.*

(c) Κύρος παντοκράτωρ. *Dem. Evang. lib. 6. c. 16.*

The *Eternity* of Christ is evident from the incommunicable Name *Jehovah* attributed to him, which, as has been prov'd, comprehends in it the Notion of Eternity, or the threefold Difference of past, present, and future Duration in its utmost Extent. However I shall confirm what has been already laid from Heb. 13. 8. *Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever*; or, as it should be rather read, *Jesus Christ, yesterday, and to day, and for ever He.* For the Name *He*, (a) is divine: and, as *Justin Martyr* tells us, signifies *Him who is truly God*, (b); and so is a strong Argument for the Truth of the Divinity of Christ; and is the rendring of the Hebrew Word **הִנֵּה** in this very Epistle, *ib. 1. 12.* which is also reckoned among the † Divine Names by the Cabalistick (c) *Jews*. The Terms *Yesterday, and to day, and for ever*, are the three Divisions of Duration, into Past, Present, and to Come, which stand for *Eternity*, according to *Justin Martyr*. (d) For tho' *Yesterday* properly signifies no more than the Day preceding the present, yet when it is extended beyond its proper Meaning, and not limited by Circumstances to any particular Portion of

(a) οὐδὲν.

(b) Ἡνδὲ αὐτὸς αὐτονομία οὐτος οὐτα οὐναίνει Θεός.
Cohort. ad Græc. p. 22. Edit. Steph. See also p. 19.

† Consid. Append. p. 87. and 105, 106.

(c) Buxtorf. Lexic. Chaldaic. Talmud.

(d) Cohort. ad Græc. Edit. Stephan. p. 23.

past Duration, it must be indefinitely taken for past Duration in general, which appears to be the Case here. This Manner of Expression is much the same with that in *Psalm. 90. 2. From everlasting to everlasting thou art God*, which declares his *Eternity*. This same Doctrine of the Eternity of the Son is further taught us in the 7th Chapter, ver. 3. of the same Epistle, from this Type of *Melchisedek*, of whom 'tis said, that he has no *Beginning of Days, nor End of Life* recorded in Scripture, that he might be *like to the Son of God*, or a lively Representation, in a Typical Way, of the Filial Subsistence. The Son therefore, to answer his Type, must really be without *Beginning of Days, and End of Life*, that is, no more have a Beginning of Existence, in respect of Duration past, than have an End of it, in respect of Duration to come; for that *Days* signify *Duration*, and not Time measur'd by the Sun's Revolutions, is evident from *Dan. 7. 9.* where the Terms, *Ancient of Days*, are spoken of the Father, to express his *Eternity*. If then the Negation of End of Life imports a future Eternity; the Negation of Beginning of Days, or, Beginning of Duration, which is opposed to it, must mean a past Eternity. All this then seems plainly to convince us, that the Author to the *Hebrews*, in using these Expressions, consider'd the Son, not so much in his secondary Subsistence before the Creation, as in his first or *Eternal*

Eternal Existence, as he is *Being*, or, *He*, Chap. 1. 12. and 13. 8. Otherwise it will be a difficult Matter to reconcile them to the Son in that Notion. Consider also 1 *John* 1. 2. where the Son is call'd *Eternal Life* (a); why not in the same Sense in which the Father is call'd *the Eternal God* (b)?

As for † *Isai.* 43. 10. I must continue to affirm, That, notwithstanding what the *Postscript*, p. 107. has objected against it, it is still an Argument for the Eternity of the Son; as will appear, by considering the Medium, which God makes use of to prove himself God, namely, his Knowledge of Things past and to come: For having demonstrated, in *Isai.* 41. 22, 23. and 43. 9. that the Gods of the Heathens were no True Gods, because they were unable to explain the former or past Things, and declare Things to come; He infers from both these Reasons, that He himself is *He* (c), *Isai.* 43. 10. and *God*, ver. 12. that is, the True God; which would be no conclusive Proof of the Truth of his Divinity, could any other Being, besides the True God, do the same; or, the more difficult Part, the foretelling Things to come: And then makes this further Inference, ver. 10. that

(a) Τίν ζωντες αἰώνον. (b) Τοις αἰώνιοις Θεοῖς.

† *That ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am HE: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me.*

(c) Ήν

before him there was no God formed, who could know Things past and to come, neither should there be after him. But Jesus Christ knew and foretold Things to come, *John 13. 19.* and infers from thence, as the Father had done before *Isai. 43. 10.* that He was *He*, or the True God; Therefore was He the True God, and *co-eternal* with the Father; otherwise there would be a True God, knowing Things to come, created after the Father, contrary to the above-cited Text of *Isai. 43. 10.* For if the Son knew not these Things essentially, or by virtue of his Essence, like God the Father, how cou'd he infer himself to be *He*, or the True God, any more than any other Prophet, who received the Truth from bare *Revelation*, and not from *Nature*? Or if so bold a Conclusion wou'd be Blasphemy in the Mouth of a common Prophet, what, besides the preceding Consideration of his Essential Knowledge, could make it true in the Mouth of the *Messiah*? *I am He.* And I do not doubt but it was some such like Reasoning as this, that made the Learned and Ancient Fathers of the Christian Church urge this very Text for the *Eternity* of the Son.

This Reasoning will also conclude for his *Omniscience*; for if Jesus Christ appear, both according to the Method of *Isaias*'s Arguing, and his own Inference, to be *True God* from his Fore-knowledge, then must he be *Omniscient*, that being an inseparable Attribute of

the

the True God. For if the Fore-knowledge of *some* Things infer the Truth of his Divinity; the Truth of his Divinity will infer the Knowledge of *all*, since all Things and Events depend on the Power and Providence of the True God: and therefore *Peter*, after the Testimony given to our Saviour's Divinity by his Resurrection from the Dead, confesses his Omnipotence in the following Words, *Lord, thou knowest all Things*, John 21. 17. which had been acknowledg'd, upon lesser Evidence, by the Apostles before, *John 16. 30.* So that I shall be bold to say, That, according to the preceding Doctrines, the Divine Nature of Christ could never be ignorant of the Day of Judgment, but only the Human; which, receiving the Light of Wisdom by degrees (a), could have no Revelation of this great Secret, but from the Divine Nature; which, probably, was not till after its Sufferings, when it may be supposed to have been given in that large Scene of Events, which was open'd to Christ after his Ascension into Heaven, and communicated afterwards to his Servant *John*, Rev. 1. 1. This is agreeable to one of the Interpretations given us by *Origen* of the Son's Ignorance, in his Thirtieth Treatise on St. *Matthew*, and which appears to be most reasonable; tho' not one of them refers it to the Divinity of the Son,

(a) Luke 2. 52.

as the *Arians* understand it. It is true, indeed, (a) *the Father* in one Evangelist, and *the Father* (b) *only* in another, is excepted out of the Number of those that are ignorant; but this is done not in Opposition to the Divinity of the Son, but to his Humanity, and to Angels and Men; according as the exclusive Term *Only* has been above explain'd.

But before I leave the Subject of the Attributes, I must obviate one Objection against the Eternity of the Son, taken from the Word *Creation* us'd of him before the Beginning of the World, premising only one just and reasonable Demand, to shorten the Controversy; viz. That the Silence of no Writer, either Jewish or Christian (excepting those who expressly deny the Eternal Generation of the Son of God, or have laid down such Principles as in Effect and Consequence clearly deny it) be brought as Evidence against his Eternity; and that therefore no negative Argument be drawn from their Silence in the Matter, or their bare Mentioning his coming forth before the World, in order to create it; it being as absurd to oppose Silence to positive Proof in the Article of his *Eternity*, as it wou'd be to oppose St. *Mattew* to St. *John*'s Gospel in that of his *Divinity*.

I will therefore, in order to support what has been already said in the *Considerations*.

concerning this Matter, endeavour to prove from fresh Authorities, that the Word, or Son, existed in the Father before his *Creation* or coming forth, and that it was a *real Existence*, of a distinct active Being.

I will begin with *Philo*; who tells us in his Treatise *De Mund. Opif.* p. 5. (a), that the Word of God is the *Archetypal or Ideal World*; p. 4. that it was formed or (b) conceived by God to be the Pattern of the visible World; and then gives us an Account of its Formation in the following Words; (c) *As a City designed by an Architect has no Place without Him, but is design'd in the Mind of the Artist; so the Ideal World can have no Place, but the Divine Word, which disposes and orders all Things.* Where it is to be observ'd, First, That the Word is the Place of the Ideal World, as the Artist's Mind is the Place of his Draught. Secondly, That therefore as the Mind of the Artist subsists before his Draught, so the Word must subsist before the Ideal World. And Thirdly, That the Divine Word, in which the Archetypal World is conceived, is that which disposes and orders all Things, that is, thro' the Archetype;

(a) *Edit. Paris. 1640.*

(b) Ἐνερόντες τούτους πάπες.

(c) Κατάπτει δέν οὐ εἰ τῷ αρχιτεκτονῷ προδιατυπωθεῖσα τοῖς, χάρεσιν ἐκπόσιον εἰς λεγεν, αὐλαῖς ἐνεσφράγισο τῇ τε χειρίτε φυχῇ, τὸ αὐτὸν τέρπον εἰδὲ οὐ εἰπεῖσθαι κόσμοθε αὐλον αὐλοῖς τόπον, οὐ τὸ θεῖον λόγον τὸ ταῦτα μάκοσμίσαντα.

and

and therefore must have been as distinct and active a Being before the Archetype, as it was after it ; the Archetype being this very Word reduced into little. Page 5. he tells us, (a) *That the Ideal World is nothing else but the Word of God ready to make the World, as an Ideal City is nothing else but the Mind of the Architect designing to build according to that Pattern.* Where we are taught, that the Archetypal World, fram'd in the Divine Word, is as much the Divine Word, as an Ideal City fram'd in the Mind of the Artist, is the Mind of the Artist it self ; for, indeed, both the Archetypal World and Ideal City, are the Divine pre-existing Word of God, and pre-existing Mind of the Artist, brought into a new and relative Mode of Subsistence, as the Patterns of Something to be created after them. And this he tells us is the Doctrine of Moses (b), not his own. And we may further observe, that as the Mind of the Artist, in which his Pattern is conceived, is one essentially with the Artist ; so the Word, in which the universal Archetype was conceived by God, must be one with God : no one being properly said to conceive or think out an Idea in another's Essence distinct from his

(a) Οὐδὲν ἀν ἔτερον π εἶναι τὸντον εἶ) κόσμον ἡ Θεοὶ λόγοι οὐδὲν κοσμοποιεῖθεν. εἴτε γοῦν τὸντον πόλις ἔτερον ποτί, οὐ τούτου αρχητέκτονος λόγοισι οὐδὲν τὸντον πόλιν κτίζειν διανοεῖθεν

(b) Μωϋσες γοῦν τὸ δέγμα τοτο, ἐκ ἑμῶν.

own. He gives us, p. 4. the Reason why the Word is the Place of the Archetypal World, (a) *Because there is no other Place besides the Word, capable of receiving so much as one, much less all the Divine Powers, or Attributes.* Which shews that the pre-existing Word is not a single Power it self, but the Place or Center of all the Divine Powers: And therefore it was fit that the Ideal World, formed out of all the Divine Powers, should be made in the Word, the Place of them. Which is this Author's Stile in another Place also; who, speaking of the Rock of Wisdom much after the same manner as St. Paul does, 1 Cor. 10. 4. where it stands for Christ or the Word, he says, (b) *For the high and sharp Rock is the Wisdom of God, which he cut high, and before all others, out of his own Powers;* that is, He form'd her before the World, as its Archetype, out of his own Powers, uniting and centring in the Word the Place of them. And if we wou'd know the Reason why the World could not be formed without such an Archetype, he tells us to this Effect in his Book *De Mund. Opif.* p. 5. that the Creature not being capa-

(a) Ἐπεὶ τὸς ἀντὶ εἴη τῷ θεῷ συνάμεσον ἀντὶ τόπῳ θεῷ τερπός;
οὐ γένοιτο ἀντὶ ικανὸς, καὶ λέγω πάσας, ἀλλὰ μίαν ἀκεφαλον πίπεν
δέξασθαι τὸν καρπόσα.

(b) Lib. 3. Leg. Alleg. p. 1103. Ἡ γὰρ ἀκεφαλοῦ πίπερ
ἡ σοφία τῆς Θεᾶς οὖτις, ἡντὶ ἀκεφαλοῦ καὶ περιποτίνην ἔτειδιν οὐδὲ τοῦ
ἴσωτος συνάμεσον.

ble of receiving Good as God is of giving it, God proportion'd the Good, he design'd to communicate, to the Capacities of the Creatures that were to be made by him, and to receive it from him ; which seems plainly to be meant of the Limitation of the Word in the Ideal World or Archetypal Pattern.

The next I shall mention, is *Tertullian*; who, in his Book against *Præxæs*, chap. 5, 6, 7. speaks much after the same Manner with *Philo*, and therefore ought not to be looked upon by the Author of the *Postscript* as a Montanist in this Point. I will lay down the Substance of his Doctrine in the following Propositions.

That the Word was † in God before all Things, when God was † alone.

That in and by his Word were the Reasons or Ideas of all Things formed.

That this Formation of Ideas in and by the Word, is the Creation of Wisdom, or the Word, mention'd *Prov.* 8. according to the *Septuagint* Translation.

That besides this Formation of Ideas, or *Creation* of the Word, there follow'd a *Prolation* of the Word so created or formed into Ideas, in order to make all Things outwardly, according to the Archetypal Patterns formed and conceived in and by the Word before.

†† So *Theophil. ad Autol.* 1. 2. p. 130. Ἐν τοῖς τοῖς μὲν Θεοῖς, τὸν τὸν οὐτὸν οὐ λόγον.

So that according to this Father, the *Prolation* of the Word was preceded by its *Creation*, or Formation into Ideas ; and its *Creation*, by an absolute and real *Existence*. Otherwise, if the Word subsisted not before, how could it be said to form those Ideas, which is called its *Creation* ? as is affirmed in these Words, (a) *That all Things might be made by Him (meaning the Word) by whom they had been conceived and ordered, nay, and already made, as far as they could be so in the Mind of God.*

Mr. Whiston, indeed, shews his Dislike to this Doctrine of *Prolation*, or the Son's coming forth, by suspecting it (b) to be borrowed, in the latter Part of the Second Century, from some *Prolations or Emissions of the Antient Hereticks*. Tertullian (c) was well aware of this Objection, or found it ready made to his Hands, from whence our Author probably took it ; and was so far from believing the *Prolation* of the Son to be borrowed from the Hereticks, that he tells us, on the contrary, (d) *that the Hereticks rather borrowed it from the Truth, to give Colour to their Lie* : And then shews the Difference between the

(a) *Ut per ipsum fierent universa (nempe Logon) per quem erant cogitata atq; disposita, imo & facta jam, quantum in Dei sensu.*

(b) Postscript, p. 99.

(c) *Lib. adv. Prax. c. 8.*

(d) *Imo heresis potius ex veritate accepit, quod ad mendacium suum strueret.*

Prolation held by the Church, and that by Valentinus.

To Tertullian I subjoyn Tatian, tho' elder in Time, because his Doctrine may be better understood by the Help of Tertullian. This Father teaches us, *Sect. 7. Edit. Oxon.* (a) that the Lord of all Things, or God the Father, was alone, in respect of the World not yet made.

That tho' he was alone in that Respect, yet he was not so in regard of the Ideas (b) of all Things that subsisted in him.

That therefore the Ideas of all Things subsisted in him, because his Word (c) (the Ideal World) subsisted in him.

That this Word (or Ideal World) subsisted in him by the (d) Power of the Word.

That this Power of the Word is the Word it self; that is, in its first and necessary Subsistence; as appears from *Sect. 10.* where it is (e) spoken of as a Person, and used for the Word, as the Context requires it, *Sect. 10.*

That when God willed, the Word (or Archetypal Principle) came forth (f).

(a) Ο γένος τοῦ θεοῦ — κατὰ μὲν οὐδὲπώ γε γεννέντινον ποίησιν μένθος ἦν.

(b) Σὺν μὲν τῷ πάντα. *Ibid.*

(c) Σὺν μὲν τῷ — αὐτὸς γάρ οὐ λόγος, ὃς ἦν εἰς μὲν τὸν πίστον. *Ibid.*

(d) Διὸ λογικῆς πρότιμος, the same with λόγος πίστος, a little before. *Ibid.* & *Sect. 10.*

(e) See also *Sect. 31.*

(f) *Sect. 7, 8.*

That

That his coming forth, or Birth, was in order to Create (a).

On which Propositions I make the following Remarks.

That God the Father's being *alone* before the World, did not exclude the Ideal World.

That this Ideal World is, according to *Philo* and *Tertullian*, the true and personal Word of God.

That therefore the Word of God was with the Father, when the Father was Alone; which is *Tertullian's Assertion.*

That the Power of the Word, or the Word it self, in its *first* Subsistence, is the Place of the Ideal World, or the World it self in its *secondary* Subsistence. Which is also *Philo's* and *Tertullian's Doctrine.*

That the Word in its *secondary* Subsistence, or as the Ideal World, came forth from the Father to create all Things; which is agreeable to *Tertullian.*

That this coming forth, or (b) Birth, was by the Will of the Father.

The Testimony of this Author is the more valuable, because he was the Disciple of *Justin Martyr*, and so speaks his Sentiments, and acquaints us with the Mind of that Father, when he attributes the Birth of the Son to the *Will* of the Father, namely, that it is not to be understood of his first Generation,

(a) Sect. 8.

(b) *Ibid.*

but

but his Birth or coming forth in order to Creation.

From this Father proceed we to Novatian, who, about the End of his Book *De Trinitate*, speaks thus concerning the Son, (a) *When the Father willed, the Word, the Son, was born. — When therefore the Father wou'd, the Son came forth from the Father; and He, who was in the Father, came forth from the Father: and he who was in the Father, because he was of the Father, was afterwards with the Father, because he came forth from the Father.* In which Words the following Doctrines are contained.

That the Birth and Coming forth of the Son from the Father, is the same Thing.

That this Birth or Coming forth was voluntary, not necessary.

That the Son was in the Father before his Birth or Coming forth.

That the Reason of his being in the Father before his Birth, is his being of and from the Father before his Birth; which supposes him a distinct Subsistence from his Father before his Birth.

That he was not separated from his Father after his Birth or Coming forth, but was with

(a) *Ex quo quando ipse (Pater) voluit, sermo filius natus est — Hic ergo, quando Pater voluit, processit ex Patre, & qui in Patre fuit, processit ex Patre: & qui in Patre fuit, quia ex Patre fuit, cum Patre postmodum fuit, quia ex patre processit:*

the Father ; and that his being born of, or coming out of the Father, is the Reason of his being always with the Father afterwards, and not separated from him ; that is, he being of the same inseparable Essence with the Father, cou'd never, by any voluntary *Prolation*, be separated from the Father.

I cannot leave this Author without taking Notice, that his Stile of speaking, in ascribing the Birth of the Son to the *Will of the Father*, is, together with *Tatian's*, a good Key to interpret those Antients, who have spoken of his Birth after the same manner; such as St. *Ignatius* and *Justin Martyr* in particular, as has been observed before, who both make him Son of God, and born of the Father *by his Will and Power*. For as our Author speaks in the Terms of these Antients, he may be supposed to have received both the Terms themselves, and their true Meaning, as these Fathers used them, partly from their Writings, and partly from Tradition ; and to have used them himself in the very same Sense in his own Treatise ; and to be therefore a Cloud of Witnesses for the true Notion of the voluntary Generation of the Son of God. So that it may be needless to cite any more on this Article.

I shall only add one Passage out of *Job*, to confirm the Truth of the Doctrines of these Antients ; who, speaking of Wisdom, says, chap. 28, 27. *Then did He see it, and number*

her it; *He prepared it, yea, and searched it out.* In which Words three Things are to be enquired into; First, What the Numbering of Wisdom means: Secondly, When she was number'd: Thirdly, How she was seen before she was numbered. Numbring supposes a Plurality, but the Essence of Wisdom is one simple Essence; Numbring cannot therefore relate to the Essence of Wisdom. Neither can it belong to her essential Attributes, or Perfections, in the common Notion of the Word; for Numbring supposes an Ignorance of the Plurality numbered; otherwise to what purpose is it numbered? But God cou'd never be ignorant of the essential Perfections of Wisdom, who receives her Subsistence from Him. Numbring then must be understood in another Sense, in which it is found in Scripture, namely, for doing or working in Number and Proportion. So God is said, Psalm 147. 4. *to tell the number of the Stars*, that is, to have created them in a certain Number known to himself. And Isai. 65. 12. *to number Idolaters to the Sword*, that is, to deliver up a certain Number of them to Destruction. In this Sense then Wisdom seems to be number'd, as formed or brought forth by God in Number, not in regard of her essential Perfections, which she always had with her Essence before her Numbring; for God *saw her*, that is, contemplated her as the Object of his Love, which supposes her Subsistence before

fore be numbered her : but in regard of the Multitude of Ideas conceived and formed in her, to be the Archetypal Pattern of the future Creation. So that, in short, the Numbering her is no more than the Reducing the Simplicity and Unity of her Essence into a certain Number of Archetypal Ideas, in order to Creation. For that this was done before the Creation, which is the second Enquiry, is evident from the preceding Verses ; God understood the Way thereof, and he knew the Place thereof, when he looked to the Ends of the Earth, and saw under the whole Heaven, to make the Weight for the Wind ; and when he measured the Waters in a Measure : when he made a Decree for the Rain, and a Way for the Lightning of the Thunder, then did he see it and (a) number it, &c. Thirdly, God saw her before he numbered her, that is, knew her as subsisting in the Unity and Simplicity of her Essence, before he multiply'd her into Ideas, and therefore she really was, or pre-existed ; for that which is not, is neither seen nor known. Which answers the third Enquiry.

From what has been said, it will appear, both from Sacred and Human Authority, that the Word or Son existed before his Creation or Coming forth.

(a) See *Eccles. 19.*

That it was a real Existence, because the very pre-existing Word was created, and came forth.

And that the Word so pre-existing was a distinct and active Being; *distinct*, as being of and from the Father before his Creation and Coming forth; and *active*, as co-operating with him in his own Creation or Formation into Ideas.

It is plain then, that the above-cited Christian Fathers no more believed the Metaphysical Existence of the Son before his Creation, than those mention'd in the *Considerations*; or that he was originally an (*) Attribute in the Father, and afterwards created or begotten into a Person. Neither, indeed, is it credible that any other of them ever did so: For if he is mistaken in charging the Notion upon the Author of the *Considerations*, which he never thought of till he found it in the *Postscript*; 'tis no Wonder if he be no less out, in laying it upon the Antients. They have proved themselves too good Reasoners in other Matters, to fall into so wild an Opinion, that one single Attribute of the Father cou'd be created or begotten into all his Attributes, which it must be, if it be begotten into the Son; because all the Divine Attributes, except those which are properly Personal or Paternal, are spoken of the Son. But this is too absurd to be

(a) *Postscript*, p. 98, 99.

pursu'd: I only wish that this Gentleman, who thinks so oddly for others, be always in the Right when he thinks for himself.

The Importance of this Article, concerning the necessary and arbitrary Existence of the Son, is so great, so directly strikes at *Arianism*, and takes the whole Authority of the Fathers out of their Hands, that I must beg Leave to proceed a little farther before I leave it, and take Notice of another Notion of the Creation of the Son, in relation to his Soul.

It is a very antient Tradition among the Jews, (a) that the Soul of the Messiah existed from the Beginning of the World. And some Learned Men are of Opinion, that certain Passages of Scripture cannot so easily and naturally be interpreted without this Notion: Such as *John* 3. 13. *No Man* bath ascended up to *Heaven*, but he that came down from *Heaven*, even the Son of *Man* which is, or was, in *Heaven*; and *Phil.* 2. 7. that he emptied himself. *Origen* was no Stranger to this Opinion, when he says, (b) *Perhaps the Soul of the Son in its Perfection, was in God and his Fulness, and coming out thence when he was sent by the Father, took a Body of Mary.* And again, upon these

(a) See *Hal. de Mess.* p. 309.

(b) *Clement. in Johan.* p. 307. C. Τάχα γδ ἡ μὲ τῇ ψευχῇ
ἐν τῇ ἑωρᾶς τογχέντες τελεότητι, ἡν Θεῷ καὶ τῷ πληρώματι
ην, καὶ ἐκεῖδεν ἡγεληλυθῆνα τῷ αἰπεῖλθαι, ἃ τῇ Πατέρες
σύνελαβε τὸ ἐν Μαρίας σῶμα.

Words of John the Baptist, *After me cometh a Man which is preferred before me, for he was before me,* John 1. 30. He says thus, that it is spoken of Christ, (a) that we may learn that the Man [or Manhood] also of the Son of God, mixed with his Divinity, had a prior Subsistence to his Birth of the Virgin. What can this Man be? Not the Divinity of the Son it self, because he was mixed with it: Not the Body taken of the Virgin, because he subsisted before the Birth of the Body. It must then be the rational Soul. Which is confirm'd by the Appearances of the Messiah made to the Patriarchs and Jewish Fathers in the Form of a Man, the proper Indication of a Human Soul. Hence then we may justly infer, that the rational Soul, united to the Word, was the first created Essence, or first Fruits of the Creation, holy to the Lord, and claimed by the Son as his own Right. For if he was to be first, or (b) have the Pre-eminence in all Things, can that Advantage be deny'd him in relation to his Soul? Origen, who holds its Pre-existence, seems to allow it to be first created. For speaking of the Formation of Wisdom before the World, he says, God created

(a) Ἡν δέ ταχέων καὶ ἀνθρώπων τοῦτον τὸν θεόν, τὸν θεόν τούτον αὐτὸν αὐτοκέντρον, αρχοβίτερον τοῦτον τὸν μαρτυρεῖς περιέρεις.

(b) Colof. 1. 18.

(a) an

(a) an animated *Wisdom*, or, *Wisdom with a Soul*. And this Opinion appear'd so very reasonable, that we find some Marks of it in the later Centuries. For the Author of the *Meditations* call'd St. *Austin's*, distinguishes between Eternal *Wisdom* the Son of *God*, and the *first created Wisdom*; which he makes to be a rational (b) and intellectual Mind; and calls it the *Heavenly Jerusalem*; that is, as I conceive it, this first created Mind, in Union with the filial uncreated *Wisdom*, is the *Heavenly Jerusalem*, the Mother of us all; or the Church. Which will prove a natural and easy Explication of the Passage in *Hermas*, *That the Church of God was created first*, that is, as to the rational and intellectual Mind or Nature united to *Wisdom* or the *Word*; and shew's us that *Creation*, in this Sense, may be univocally affirm'd of Christ and the Angels; for the Church is Christ, according to the Interpretation of *Hermas*, *Simil. 9. Sect. 1.* Tho' I must observe that Applying the Term *Created* to the Divine Nature of Christ, does not infer, as the Author of the *Postscript* imagines (c), the *Creation* of the Son to be like that of the Angels; because the Reason-

(a) Ἐμπλοκὴ οὐρανοῦ. *Comment. in Joan. p. 19.* See also p 36. & *cont. Cels. p. 63.*

(b) *Prior omnium creatarum est quadam Sapientia, qua creatarum est mens rationalis & intellectualis, cap. 19.*

(c) *Page 104.*

ing proceeds upon a false Principle, that the same Word repeated in a small Distance of Space, must have the same Meaning ; which is contrary to Scripture Observation : For the Term *Sleep* (a), used four times in the Compass of four or five Verses, has two very different Meanings ; the one, a State of spiritual Darkness or Security ; the other, of natural Death, or Separation of Soul from Body. But, after all, I believe it will appear to any one who considers the Place, to which the Author of the *Postscript* refers, (which I take to be *Simil. 5. § 5, 6.*) that the Creation of the *Spirit* or *Son* there mentioned, is not his Creation before the World, but the Union of the Word with a Body of Flesh. The printed Copy reads thus, (b) *The Holy Spirit which was infused first of all into a Body.* Two Manuscripts, instead of *infused* read *created*, but still in a Body : which is explained by being (c) *introduced into a Body* : So that it means no more than that the Word or Spirit was first united to the Body of Christ, thro' whom it was to be adoptively united to the Bodies of the Faithful ; as he says afterwards, by way of Encouragement to all Believers, (d) *Every undefiled Body shall be rewarded,*

(a) Καρδεύσωμεν, 1 Thes. 5.

(b) *Spiritum sanctum, qui infusus est omnium primus in corpore.*

(c) *Corpus in quod inductus est Spiritus Sanctus,*

(d) *Accipiet enim mercedem omne corpus purum ac sine macula repertum, in quo habitandi gratia constitutus fuerit Spiritus sanctus.*

in which the *Holy Ghost* has been put to dwell. But what is all this to the Creation of Angels in the preceding Section? Or how does it appear that the Term *Creation* is univocally taken in both Places, except it be understood of their Union with a Body?

Now whether this Jewish and Christian Notion, of a first created Mind united to the Word, be true or not, yet since it is an impossible Thing for Mr. *Whiston* to disprove the Truth of it, he ought to be cautious in what he advances concerning the *Creation* of the Word in any other Sense than has been above-explain'd

For it may be that *Arius*'s Contemplations rose no higher than this first created Mind; that therefore he attributed *Creation*, in the strictest Meaning, to the *Word*, which only belong'd to this first created Mind; that he deny'd the Word to have assum'd a reasonable Soul, because the first Mind or Soul of the *Messiah* was in his Theology the very *Word* it self; and that therefore he divided Christ, and robbed the Church of his noblest Part, in denying his Divinity.

It is probable, after all, that the Author of the *Postscript* may slight these Authorities, because most of them are later than *Justin Martyr*; Yet this is no Reason the Orthodox should do so, and part with their Arms, because they are formidable to their Enemies. *Philo* is as ancient as he can well desire, and

Nova-

Novarian may answer for the Mind of *Ignatius*; and as for Scripture, it affords more Arguments for the Son's Eternity, than he can possibly produce out of it to prove his *Creation*. After all, it is a partial and surprising Liberty this Author allows himself, of confining others, in answering his Questions and proving their Doctrines, to the two first Centuries; when, in his own Answers, and proving his Doctrines, he calls in the Assistance of the whole four: Or, indeed, it is strange, that He should reject any Kind of Authority, who brings for Proof the Constitutions and Recognitions.

The Son of God, who has been proved to have subsisted from all Eternity, and to have reduced himself into an Archetypal Subsistence, in order to the Creation, proceeded farther, after the Fall of Man, in his wonderful Condescension, and humbled himself so far as to unite his Godhead to the Human Nature, and become Man, that he might recover all that had been lost by Man. For such was the Will of the Father, that *as by Man came Death, so by Man also should come the Resurrection of the Dead*, 1 Cor. 15. 21. and that *the Seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpent's Head*, Gen. 3. 15. Now to know what the Son of God, or the Word, assumed to become Man, we must enquire into the Nature of the first Man, or his constituent Parts: To do which, it will be necessary

cessary to look back upon the History of his Creation ; for as He was, such must the Humanity of the Word be. Gen. 2. 7. we are told, that *the Lord formed Man out of the Dust of the Ground, and breathed into his nostrils the Breath of Life, and Man became a living Soul.* Where we learn but two constituent Parts only, the *Body* out of the *Dust*, and the *Breath of Life*, to quicken and animate it. The same Principles are inculcated Ezek. 37. in his visional Resurrection of dry Bones. For, First, There is a Formation of the Bodies of the Deceas'd, *the Sinews and the Flesh came up upon them, and the Skin covered them above ; but there was no Breath or Spirit in them.* Secondly, *God breathed into them from the four Winds, and they lived, and stood upon their Feet*, ver. 9, 10. The only Difference between the two Accounts is this, that the Principle breathed into the Body at its Creation is call'd the *Breath of Life* ; but that at its Resurrection the *Spirit* ; probably to shew, that the Life of this quickening Principle will be as much exalted in the Resurrection above what it was in the Creation, as the Force of a *Wind* is above that of a *Breath*. The Question is, what this *Breath of Life*, or *Spirit*, is, that quickens the *Body*? The Answer is easy ; the (*a*) rational *Soul*, as containing in

(a) See Iren. l. 5. c. 12. Theophil. ad Autol. p. 119. Tertul. con. Marc. l. 2. c. 9. Glorios. Hom. 13. in Gen. 2. August. lib. 7. de Gen. ad Lit. c. 3. And for the Jews, see Fa-
gius in Gen. 2. 7.

it a vital and quickening Power : For nothing else was added either to the first created Body of *Adam*, or the reformed Bodies of the Dead, to make them living Men, but this Principle; which it could not have done, had it been any thing less than a rational Soul. Neither cou'd we have had a just History of the Creation of *Adam*, beyond that of the Brutes, if the rational Soul were excluded the Account. As then the first Man who brought in Death, consisted of a rational Soul and Body; so Man, who was to cause the Resurrection of the Dead, was to be of the same Principles; otherwise he wou'd not be Man, but of a different Species; nor wou'd it be true, *that as by Man came Death, so by Man also should come the Resurrection of the Dead.* The Son of God therefore, or the Word, took upon him a rational Soul, and Body, to redeem Man; for since it was the Free-Will of the rational Soul in *Adam* that sinned unto Death, the Free-Will of the rational Soul was to obey unto Life. For if the Word only were united to Flesh, and this Word be not confounded with the first created Being or Mind, of an Intellectual Nature, like Human Souls, what cou'd the Word do for the Redemption of Man, being it self of a different Nature from the Soul of Man? And how cou'd it be true, *that, as by one Man's Disobedience many were made Sinners, so by one Man's Obedience many should be made righteous,* Rom. 5. 15, 19. The

The New Testament is very express in this Point : Christ says, *Matth. 26, 38. My Soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto Death* ; and *Acts 2. 27.* St. Peter applies to Christ *Psalm 16. 10. For thou wilt not leave my Soul in Hell.* What Soul ? Not the Body, for it could not be sorrowful, having no Life nor Sensation in it self, as appears from its Creation ; otherwise to what Purpose was the Breath of Life inspired into it to render it capable of vital Operations ? But further, the Soul is opposed to Flesh or Body, ver. 31. and therefore is not to be confounded with the Body, or comprehended under it : The Soul then must be the *Breath of Life*, or rational Soul breathed into the Body ; for we have no Mention but of these two Principles, nor of any other Soul given to the Body, but this one ; which, as in its superior Faculty it is rational, so in its inferior is it sensible and quickning, inspiring Life into the inanimate Body. This is called Spirit or Ghost, *Matth. 27. 50.* as it is call'd *Ezek. 37. 8.* and was (a) breathed out by Christ, when he dy'd upon the Cross, as a plain Indication that it was the *Breath of Life*, that had been breathed into him from the Beginning ; and was commended into the Hands of the Father, as a Divine Principle breathed out of him,

(a) *Luke 23. 46.* compar'd with *Matth. 27. 50.* and *John 19. 30.*

and to whom, as its Origine, it had a Right of Returning ; in Distinction from the Spirits of Brutes, that go downwards to the Earth, Eccles. 3. 21.

Irenæus confirms this Doctrine of a rational Soul in the Person of Christ ; For, says he, (a) *Christ gave his Soul for our Souls, and his Flesh for our Flesh.* As then the Flesh of Christ was the same with our Flesh, for which it was given, so must the Soul of Christ be the same with our Souls ; and this Author's Notion of the Souls of Men will explain to us his Notion of the Soul of Christ. In his second Book, chap. 60. he attributes Seeing, Hearing, Thinking, Memory, and Mind it self, to the Soul ; and makes it the Subject of the Visions of the Prophets ; that is, he looked upon the same Soul to be the Principle of Reasoning and Sensation, and did not multiply it according to its Faculties. Chap. 62. he affirms the Soul, with the Body, and nothing more, to go into Hell, in a damned Person ; and yet we certainly know from the (b) Story of the Rich Man, Luke 16. and from the Apology of the Wicked at the general Resurrection, Matth. 25. 44. that the Souls of the Damned have the Faculty of Reasoning ; therefore, according to this Fa-

(a) Τοι μείς δόντος οὐ λαζίν ωπερεὶς οὐ μετέπειν τυχαῖς, οὐ τοις τοις οὐτοῖς οὐπερεὶς οὐ μετέπειν τοις τοις. Lib. 5 c. 1.

(b) Irenæus argues from hence, That separate Souls have a Remembrance of their past Actions.

ther,

her they were rational. But these rational Souls were not the Spirits of the Damned, according to this Father's Division of Body, Soul, and Spirit; for he allows no Spirits to (a) Damned Persons: Therefore the Soul, in this Father's Division of a perfect Man, is the Rational Soul. If then the Souls to be redeem'd were rational Souls, then must the Soul of Christ, that was given for them, be also rational; there appearing no more Reason for our taking Soul in an equivocal Sense, than the term Flesh; and by consequence this Father's notion of the Soul of Christ, was that of a rational One.

The same Doctrine of a reasonable Soul in the Person of Christ is asserted by *Tertullian*, who says, (a) *That therefore the Son of God descended, and entered into a Soul, not that the Soul might know it self in Christ, but that it might know Christ in it self:* which is evidently to be understood of a rational Soul, as the Context will shew; for a pure sensitive Soul is uncapable of Knowledge; and the Divine Word or Reason, as it is the Light of the Soul, can be received into nothing but a rational or intellectual Faculty.

Origen in his 2d Book against *Celsus*, p. 62, 63, 64. says of the Soul and Body of Christ,

(a) *Lib. 2 c. 62.*

(b) *Propterea filius Dei descendit, et animam subiit, non ut ipsa se anima cognosceret in Christo, sed ut Christum in semetipsa.*

that

that the Word spoke by them, or used them as an Organ; as the Soul and Body of a Prophet were the Organ of God who spoke by him. Now it is certain that God spake by the rational Soul of the Prophets, both according to *Irenæus*; *Lib. 2. c. 60.* and the Story of the Prophets, who understood not only the more easy of their Prophesies relating to their own Times, but also the Substance of the more difficult Ones relating to the Messiah; tho' not the Time of fulfilling them, *1 Pet. 1. 10, 11.* Therefore, according to this Father also, the Word assumed a rational Soul; which is further evident from his Notion of the Pre-existence of the Soul of the Messiah. Other Authors might be cited for the same purpose, but these are sufficient.

I shall only shew that *Justin Martyr* is still on our Side, notwithstanding that the Postscript (a) calls it a strong Proof against the rational Soul in the Person of Christ. It is there roundly enough asserted, but how true will appear afterwards, *That the Antient Christians ever esteemed Man made up directly of Body, Soul, and Spirit, without dreaming that one of them was a bare Influence only.* If this were true, then cou'd they never exclude Man from the Spirit, for this were to unman him: But *Irenæus* expressly excludes Sinners from the Spirit, as appears from the above-cited passage

(a) *Pag. 97.*

Lib. 2. c. 26. and the Bulk of Mankind, *Lib. 2. c. 12.* where he attributes Spirit to those *only*, who keep under their Appetites: But the Breath of Life, or rational Soul to all Mankind in general. Nay he makes *Adam* himself to have had nothing superiour to a *Living* or rational *Soul* before his Fall, as having not yet attained by the Conquest of his Appetites to the quickening *Spirit*: which *Spirit* he calls a Portion of God's *Spirit*, *C. 8.* and the *Spirit* poured forth in the latter Times on the Children of Adoption, *c. 12.* and this in Opposition to the Breath of Life in common to all Men. One then of the Antient Christians at least differs from Mr. *Whiston* in the Division of Man, and looks upon the *Spirit* as a Divine *Manifestation*, or an *Assisting Form*, (a) in the Soul of Man. Of the same Mind is *Tatian, Orat. ad Graecos*, § 22. 25. who calls the *Spirit* in Man superadded to the *Soul*, the Divine *Spirit* and *Spirit* of God; denies it to be in all Men, and attributes it to the Obedient *only*; who on this Account are properly and solely Men, as being in the Image and Likeness of God. § 24.

But the Postscript proceeds and tells us, *That when Justin and others mention in general but two, Soul and Body, they mean the same thing as when they enumerate all three, Spirit, Soul, and Body.* I must own I have look'd over all the Treatise *de Resurrectione*

(a) *N. B. Forma assistens.*

again,

again, and have not been able to find as to *Justin* any manner of Expression, that encourages this Observation. I wish the Author had pointed out the Passages. However since he gives the following Reason, I will consider it. *The sensitive Soul*, says he, *is by them looked upon as still belonging to or contained in the Body*, as *Justin speaks*: and, *by the Body*, they do not mean a dead senseless Carcass, but a living Body, with all its sensitive Operations and Actions; or a Body with its sensitive Soul. So that, according to this Author, when they mention Body and Soul only, the Body stands for Body and Soul, and the Soul for the Spirit. It must be confess'd indeed, that *Justin*, p. 191. *de Resurrectione*, says, *that the Soul is in the Body*, which he explains a Line or two after by saying, *that the Body is the House of the Soul*. But then he says also, *that the Spirit is the House of the Soul*. If then the Soul belong to the Body because contained in the Body, as *Mr. Whiston* reasons, then must the Soul also belong to the Spirit because contained in the Spirit; and being comprehended under both of them, the Division shou'd be made into Body and Spirit, not Body and Soul; which we need not doubt but *Justin* wou'd have done, had that been his Opinion, which is asserted in the Postscript. But, says he, *Justin* and others, by a Body, meant *a Body with a sensitive Soul*. If so, then wherever Body and rational

Rational Soul are mentioned, Sensation must not be affirmed of the Rational Soul, but the Body only; otherwise there wou'd be two sensible Souls, one contained in and united to the Body, and the other substantially one with the Rational: But Sensation is affirmed of the Soul which is Rational, as is evident from *Justin* in his Second Apology, p. 143. *Edit. Steph.* where he affirms, (a) that the *Souls of the Unjust are sensible, after Death, of the Pains of Punishments*, that is, the Rational Souls, as may be gathered from the Citation he makes a little before out of *Matth.* 10. 28. *but rather fear him, who is able to destroy both Soul and Body in Hell.* Which if it be the sensible Soul and not the Rational, then is not the whole Man punished, that has sinned against God by profane Reasonings, and a corrupt Use of the Free-will, but only the Inferiour and Brutal Sort. Which is contrary to *Luke* 16. and *Matth.* 25. 44. which supposes the Souls of the Damned to be capable of Reasoning: therefore the Soul destroyed with the Body is the Rational Soul; and by consequence the *Souls of the Unjust, that are sensible after Death, of the Pains of Punishment*, were meant by this Father to be Rational Souls; there being no Reason from the Circumstances of the Context to vary the Meaning of the same Word in so small a Compass;

(a) Κολαζεντος οι αινιρε και μετα θανατον τας της αιδησιας Κυριος.

and therefore the Soul, of which *Sensation* is affirmed, or the sensible Soul, is not contained or comprehended in the Body, but is substantially one with, or a lower Faculty of the rational Soul, and comprehended under it. Of the same Mind is *Irenaeus*, *Lib. 2. c. 60.* and *Tertullian* in his *Treatise de Anima*, and *Tatian* the Disciple of *Justin*, § 21, who may speak for his Master as well as himself.

The Mistake of the Author of the Postscript in this Matter, seems to proceed upon a Principle that the sensitive and rational Soul in Man are two distinct and separate Essences; but the above-cited Authors, who held the rational Soul to be sensible, plainly supposed it to be one Essence. (a) *Tertullian* affirms it in his *Book de Anima*, c. 12, but we say the Mind is so united with the Soul, not as one Substance with another, but as a Faculty or Power with its Substance. And so do's the Author of the Questions and Answers to the Orthodox, in his (b) Answer to Question 72. All created and rational Essences have two perceptive Powers, the *Sensitive* and *Intellectual*. If then the sensitive and rational Soul in Man be one Substance, and the Word took the sensitive Soul with the Body of Man, he must consequently take the Rational; no

(a) *Nos autem animum ita dicimus anima concretum, non substantiae alium, sed ut substantiae officium.*

(b) *Πάσαις οικουστέ καὶ λογικαὶ κοιναὶ διπλάς ἔχοντες ταλαντίνες δύναμες, αισθητικαὶ καὶ νοητικαὶ.*

sensitive

sensitive Soul being of a distinct Substance from the Rational, but that of Brutes, which I suppose none can be so bold as to attribute to the Word.

But after all, the *Arian Notion*, of the Soul of Christ being meerly sensitive, may be less favourable to them, than they are forward to imagine, since it tends to destroy one of their main Tenets, *the Sufferings of the Word*. For if the sensitive Soul be distinct from the Word, as it must be, if it be assumed with the Body by the Word, and the Word do the Office of a rational Soul, which in their Philosophy is a different Substance from that of the Sensitive; and if the Sufferings of the Body are perceived in the sensitive Soul, that being the proper Subject of Sensation, to what purpose are they felt in the Word, as they needs must be if the Word be passible. Or if the Word be passible and capable of Sensation, to what purpose was a sensitive Soul united with it together with the Body? Since this is to multiply Subjects without a Cause, and make two sensitive Souls in the same Body. Either therefore they must deny the *Word* to have a Sense of the Sufferings of the Body, as (a) *Irenæus* and other Ancient (b) Fathers do, or make the sensible Soul to be one Substance with the Word, which

(a) Pag. 250. (b) *Tertul. adv. Præx. Novat. de Trin. c. 20*

(c) *Orig. Huet. Vol. 2. p. 413. B. Euseb. Dem. Evang. p. 168, 169. with others. (d) Clem. Alex. Serom, L. 5. p. 594.*

will contradict their Notion of the sensitive Soul's being contained in the Body, and make Christ to consist but of *Two* constituent Parts, Word and Body, in opposition to *Justin Martyr*, who asserts them to be *Three*, Word, Soul, and Body.

There remains one small Objection still behind to the Doctrine of a rational Soul in the Person of Christ, which is that (a) *he was made Flesh, had a Body prepared him, &c.* To which I answer, that supposing the Opinion of the Pre-existence of Human Souls, which was entertain'd among the Jews in the Time of St. Paul and St. John, or of the Pre-existence of the Human Soul of the Messiah in particular, it only follows that the Human Soul of Christ was vitally united in the Womb of the Virgin to the Body prepared for it, as other Human pre-existing Souls are united to theirs. And hence he might, according to *Matth. 26. 38.* very properly say, *My Soul (i. e. my Human Rational Soul) is exceeding sorrowful.* Nevertheless, the Author of the Postscript cannot but know that *Flesh* in the Language of the Scripture is frequently us'd for the *whole Man.*

To sum up all that has been said on the Subject or Article of the Incarnation, it is evident,

That it was necessary that Man Ruined by Man, shou'd be Redeemed by Man.

That the *Logos*, or Word took upon him the Nature of Man to redeem Man.

That the Nature of the first Man consisted only of a Body and Breath of Life or rational Soul.

That the Word in taking upon him the Nature of Man, assumed a Body and reasonable Soul.

That Reasoning and Sensation in Man belong to the same individual Substance or Soul.

That therefore the Word cou'd not take the Sensitive Soul of Man without assuming the Rational.

That the Sufferings of the Body upon the Cross were felt in the Soul as Sensitive.

That therefore the Word cou'd not suffer without making two Sensitive Souls in the same Man.

That the Word is Impassible.

Having proved that Jesus Christ is true God and true Man, I shall endeavour to add something to what has been already said in the *Considerations*, concerning the Divinity of the *Holy Ghost*; and shall begin with *Philo*, who (a) gives to the Divine Spirit the Appellations of *Eternal Knowledge*, and the *All-wise Spirit*. And speaking of the Communication of it from *Moses* to the Seventy Elders,

(a) *Lib. de Gigant.* p. 287. *Edit. Paris.* 1640.

he uses these (a) Words, If therefore the proper Spirit of Moses, or any other Creature, had been to be communicated to such a Multitude of Friends, it must have been diminished by its Division into so many Parts. But now the Spirit in him is Wise, Divine, Immortal, [or, that cannot be cut into Pieces] Invisible, most Beautiful, Filling all Things, Beneficial; that is, not damaged when communicated, nor diminished in its Understanding, Knowledge, and Wisdom, when dispensed to others. In which the following Truths are contain'd: That the Divine Spirit is All-wise, Eternal, and Omnipresent, That it is communicable to others, without Loss to itself. That no created Spirit is so communicable. And that therefore the Divine Spirit is no Creature at all, much less a Creature of the Son, as the Postscript affirms, p. 82.

Again, speaking of Knowledge, p. 165, which is the same with the Divine Spirit, according to p. 287. (b) he says, If thou honourest thy Father who made the World, and

(a) Εἰ μὲν τὸ ἴδιον ἀπὸ Μωσεῖς πνῦμα, οὐ πν. ἀλλὰ γόντες, περτφ. πλίθες γνωσέων ἔμελλε διατείνεσθαι, ταῦτα περιπτάδεν εἰς μοίχες τοσαντας ἔμεινετο. οὐν τοῦ ἐπιπνοῦ πνῦμαί δι τὸ σοφὸν, τὸ θεῖον, τὸ ἀγαπητόν, τὸ αἰδιαίρετον, τὸ εἰσεῖον, τὸ πάντη δι' ὀλον ἀπετεληρωθόν, διπορεύεσθαι τὸ βλέπειν) μεταποδεῖν ἐτέρω, εἰδίαι μὲν φρεστεῖδεν ἐλεστεῖδεν τὸ σώματιν, καὶ δηπισύμνιν, καὶ σοφίαν.

(b) Εάν τοῦ πατέρεω μὲν τὸ γεννήσαντα κόσμον, μητέρα δὲ τὸν σορίαν, δι' οὐδὲ απετελέσθαι τὸ πᾶν, πινεῖς αἰξιώσως, αὐτὸς εἰς πεῖση, πεῖται γε καθηκός, όπερε οὐ πλήρης Θεός, οὐτε οὐ ακραγέτης σπουδίσιμη.

Wif.

Wisdom thy Mother, by whom the Universe was perfected, the Advantage will redound to thy self. For neither do's the All-sufficient God, nor Supreme and All-perfect Knowledge stand in need of any thing. From which may be drawn the following Observations. That Knowledge or the Divine Spirit is called our Mother, which is agreeable to St. John's Style, who says, we are born of the Holy Ghost, *ch. 3. 5, 6, 8.* That the Terms Father and Mother import properly an Equality of Essence between God and the Spirit, such as is between a Natural Father and Mother; and for the same Reason an Equality of Honour, due to them Both from the Faithful, their Children. That All-sufficiency is equally affirmed of them Both. And that Knowledge, or the Divine Spirit, is All-perfect. From which Attributes and Appellations of Eternal All-wise, Omnipresent, All-sufficient, All-perfect, and Mother, even as God is our Father, given to the Spirit in both these Citations, it may be inferred that the Author of them believed the Divine Spirit to be nothing less than True God.

To this Testimony of *Philo* may be subjoined that of *Eusebius*, in his *Prep. Evan.* *Lib. 7. c. 15.* Who says, (a) That all ~~free~~

(a) Ἐν δεν οἱ πάτερες Εὐραῖον θεολόγοι, μετὰ τὸ δὲ πάτερν Θεόν, καὶ μετὰ τὸ πατερότονον ἀντεῖσθαι σοφίαν. τὸν τεττυρικὸν ἀγίαν δύναμιν, ἀκούειν Πυρδίαν περιστερίας, ἀποθεωμένου.

ish Doctors, after the God over all, and after Wisdom his first begotten, Deify, or hold for God, a Third and Holy Power, which they call the Holy Ghost.

From the Jews proceed we to Christians: The first of whom shall be *Hermas*, who *Mandat.* 10. § 2. speaks thus. (a) Every Spirit, given of God, is not asked; but having the Virtue of the Godhead, it speaks all things of it self, for it is from above, from the Virtue of the Divine Spirit. Where it is evident that the Virtue of the Godhead is interpreted afterwards by the Virtue of the Divine Spirit: which may dispose us to believe that in the Sense of this Author the Spirit was God. Again says he, (b) *These sort of Men* (the Doubtful) know not what Questions to put to the Godhead, that is, to the Virtue of the Divine Spirit communicated to the Prophet, as appears from the preceding Section, where the Doubtful are represented as consulting a false Spirit under the Notion of its being the Divine Spirit, or the Virtue of it, in a true Prophet. If then the Godhead or Virtue of the Godhead stand for the Divine Spirit and its Virtue, doth it not further appear that this Antient Writer looked upon the Spirit to be God?

(a) *Omnis enim Spiritus a deo datus, non interrogatur, sed habens virtutem Divinitatis, a se omnia loquitur, quid defursum est, a virtute divini Spiritus.*

(b) *Hujusmodi non intelligunt quæsiones Divinitatis.*

The

The next Authority shall be taken out of *Athenagoras*, *Legat. Edit. Oxon. p. 41.* whose Words are these, (a) *We also say that the Holy Ghost it self, which moves the Prophets, is an Efflux from God, flowing forth and returning to him as a Ray of the Sun.* He had been shewing just before that the Son came forth from the Father; and then adds, that the Holy Ghost also flows from the Father, making God the Father the common Fountain of Son and Holy Ghost, but after different Manners; if then the Spirit come out of the common Root of the Godhead no less than the Son, how can it be said to be created by the Son, or be his first Creature? and if it be an (b) *Efflux from God, as Wisdom it self, or the Word is a pure (c) Efflux or Emanation from the Glory of the Almighty, Wisd. 7. 25.* why shou'd it partake less of the Divine Nature, than the Word it self? And if it flow from God as a Ray from the Sun, then must it be *consubstantial*, or of the same Essence with God, as the Ray is with the Sun; and since it has *personal* Attributes given to it in Scripture, it must be a *Consubstantial Person*, that is, true God. But if we proceed, and consider the antecedent and following Reasoning,

(a) Μάιτοι καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν τοῖς ἐκρωνεῖσθαι σερπίταις ἄγον Πνεῦμα, ἀπόρροιαν ἐπι τῷ φαῖ Θεῖ, ἀπόρροιος καὶ ἐπιταφερέμενον ὡς αὐτῆς ἡλίῳ. See also p. 118.

(b) ἀπόρροια.

(c) ἀπόρροια.

we shall find the Divinity of the Holy Ghost to be the common Doctrine of this Author's Times. For the better Understanding of which we must consider, that the Apologist had been wiping off a wicked and false Imputation laid upon the Christians, that they were Atheists; which he does by shewing that they held one God the Father, God the Son, and the Holy Ghost: and then infers that it was Matter of Wonder that they, who held these, shou'd be accounted Atheists. Now if the Holy Ghost were not God in their Opinion, but an inferiour Being, how cou'd they prove themselves to be no Atheists by acknowledging a Being that was no God? They might indeed infer it from their confessing God the Father and God the Son, whom they believed God; but to what purpose was the Holy Ghost joyned as a Third with them to strengthen the Inference, if he were not allowed by them to be real God? It must then necessarily follow, since they purged themselves from the Imputation of Atheism by confessing these three Persons, that, if they acted sincerely, they believed each and all of them to be True God. And since this Confession was not made in the Author's own Name, but in that of the Church, as being an Account of their Faith in his Apology made for them to the *Roman* Emperours, it must be looked upon as a glorious and publick Declaration of the Faith of the Church in those

those Times, concerning the Divinity of the Holy Ghost,

The same Doctrine may be further proved from p. 110. of the same Author; where having justified his Distinction between (a) God and *Matter* from the like Distinction of their Poets and Philosophers, he proceeds to tell them, First, what they believed and taught of God. 2dly. What they taught of *Matter*. And under the first Article of God, he comprehends Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as united in One; which wou'd have been foreign to the Design of the Article, had not the Holy Ghost been believed to have been God. For as for created Spirits, he considers them afterwards, under the second Article, as employed in the Care and Government of *Matter*.

The next Witness for the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, is *Tertullian*, who tho' he denies a Plurality of Gods, yet wou'd not have it understood, as if (b) the Father were not God, nor the Son God, nor the Holy Ghost God, nor ev'ry one God. A little after he affirms, (c) That the Name of God and Lord, belong to Father Son and Holy Ghost, Ch. 30. He calls the Holy Ghost the *Third in the God-*

(a) See p. 17. 57, &c. and 93.

(b) *Lib. adv. Prav.* c. 13. *Non quasi non & Pater Deus, & Filius Deus, & Spiritus Sanctus Deus, & Deus Unusquisq;*

(c) *Dei nomen & Domini, & Patri & filio & Spiritui conuenire.*

head; (a) and makes him consubstantial with the Father, *Ch. 24.* and tells us *Ch. 31.* that it is the Prerogative of the Evangelical above the Jewish Economy to bring us to the Knowledge and Belief of Three Persons, *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and One God.* Now if it can be proved that this was the peculiar Enthusiasm of the Spirit of *Montanism*; or that *Tertullian* did not always hold the Rule of Faith in this Meaning, tho' he held always the same Form of Words or Rule; and that therefore he prevaricated in appealing to the old Rule of Faith, which he held and explained in a new Meaning; or if it can be shewn that his Doctrine differed from that of the Catholick Church, especially as explained by *Athenagoras*; and that it was charged upon him as Part of his Montanist Errors by the Antient Christians, then will his Writings be of no Authority in this Controversy. But if this cannot be proved, and his Doctrine be agreeable both to Scripture, and the Writers of the greatest Antiquity, as will appear from the Considerations and the above-cited Authorities, then ought it to be looked upon as a good and very weighty Testimony for the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and a just Interpretation of the Rule of Faith delivered to the Church.

But, in Opposition to this Doctrine, the *Postscript* tells us, p. 82. that the Holy Ghost

(a) *Tertium numen Divinitatis.*

is a *Creature*, and endeavours to prove it from *John I. 3. All Things were made by him, and without him was not any Thing made.* Which, I am of Opinion, proves nothing to the Purpose, but only upon Supposition that the Spirit was made; which is Begging the Question. For if it be granted that the Spirit is a *Creature*, it necessarily follows that he was made by the Word, the Design of the Text being to teach us that ev'ry *Creature* was made by the Word. But if he be not granted to be a *Creature*, the Proving all *Creatures* to have been made by the Word, can never convince the Orthodox that the Spirit is a *Creature*. *Origen* had a right Notion of the Force of this Reasoning, and therefore says
 (a) *I am of Opinion, that the Person who asserts the Holy Ghost to be made, and allows all Things to have been made by the Word, must necessarily own that the Holy Ghost was made by the Word.* In which Words he does not absolutely infer from the Text a Necessity of Believing that the Holy Ghost was made; but only upon the Supposition of his being believ'd to be made, he infers the Necessity of believing that he was made by the Son. The Inference, indeed, was the Opinion of this

(a) *Comment. in Joan. p. 56.* Οἵμαι γάρ ὅπ πολὺ φάσκονται γεννητὸν. οὐτὸς δέ, καὶ περιεμένω τὸ πάντα δι' οὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, εναγγειαῖον φέρεται, ὅπ τὸ ἄγνοιον Πνεῦμα μία τῷ λόγῳ ἐγένετο.

Father, but it was upon the following Principle, that he must otherwise be (a) innate like the Father, if not made by the Son, as if there were no Medium of Existence between Self-origination and Creation; and he wou'd make us believe that the Self-origination of the Spirit, is the Consequence of their Opinion, who deny the Spirit to be made by the Son. But with what Justice he does this, let those consider, who, with older Authority, keep the middle Way, and believe that the Holy Ghost proceeded or flow'd out from God the Father. *But*, if *Rufinus* may be believ'd in his Apology for *Origen*, (b) this learned Father has asserted in his Writings, *There is no Place of Scripture can be brought to prove that the Holy Ghost is a Creature.*

As for the Passage taken out of *Irenaeus*, l. 5. c. 10. to prove the Holy Ghost to be God and Creatour; I am almost of Opinion, the Author of the Postscript would have objected nothing against it, had he compared it with *Tertullian* against *Marcion*, lib. 2. c. 9. where the Stile of Speaking and Reasoning is so like that of *Irenaeus*, that one wou'd almost think he had the very Passage before him, when he wrote that Chapter. For, First, He makes the same Distinction between the Spirit and

(a) *A. Non. Q.*

(b) *De Adulterat. Lib. Orig. Nusquam inveniri in omni Scriptura, ubi Spiritus Sanctus factus vel creatus diceretur.*

Breath of Life, or Soul, as *Irenaeus*. Secondly, He calls the Spirit, the Spirit of God, and God. Thirdly, He affirms the Breath of Life, or Soul, to be made by the Spirit; both which are asserted in the (a) Considerations to have been taught by *Irenaeus* in the Passage referr'd to: So that I cannot but look upon this to be an antient Testimony of the Mind of *Irenaeus*.

The Postscript also (b) answers the Argument taken from (c) 1 Cor. 2. 10. for the Divinity and Consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost, by saying, *What Need of Search and Enquiry, if the Spirit knew those deep Things as well as the Father?* Nay, how can there be Room for Search, unless there be two real Beings concerned? But he is greatly mistaken in his Notion of the Word *Search*, which does not always stand for *Enquiry*, as he imagines; but sometimes for *Knowing*, as in this Place; for so the Apostle explains himself in the next Verse, *Even so the Things of God knoweth no one but the Spirit of God.* In which Sense it is taken Job 28. 27. who speaking of Wisdom, says, *that God saw it and numbered it, he prepared it, yea, and searched it out; that is perfectly knew it. For it cannot be*

Psal. 139. 1.

Prov. 20. 27.

2 Sam. 10. 3.

Psalm 7. 9.

Jer. 2. 20.

Rom. 1. 4.

Rev. 2. 23.

(a) Sect. 31.

(b) Page 81.

(c) *The Spirit searcheth all Things, even the deep Things of God.*

† See the Use of ὁράω in the LXX.

suppos'd, that after God had seen, number'd, and prepar'd Wisdom, he should stand in need of *searching* her, in order to know her. So that, let the Meaning of *searching* be what it will, it can never import an Ignorance in God of Wisdom searched into; and therefore the Term may be used, where the Knowledge is already perfect, and incapable of Improvement. Secondly, *Searching* does not imply that *two real Beings are concerned*, as is evident from Psalm 77. 6. *And I searched out my Spirit*, as it is read by the Septuagint, Vulgar, and Syriac Versions. For if the Spirit be the rational Soul, as I conceive Mr. *Whiston* understands it, what constituent Part of a Man can search the Spirit of a Man, but the rational Soul or Spirit it self? Surely the senseless Body, or Soul as sensitive, can never search the Soul as rational, nor the inferior Powers enquire into the superior. Then the Spirit searches it self, there may be Room for Search, and yet not two real Beings concerned in it. Thirdly, Neither is the *Spirit of a Man really different from the Man whose Things he knows*, in any Philosophy, as it is taken for the rational Soul. For, as such, it is the very Difference of Man, that makes him what he is, and distinguishes him from all Beings of another Species; that Man cannot be Man, or a reasonable Creature, without it: and therefore it is so far from being really different from him, that it is the

very

very Thing that denominates him Man. If then the Spirit of God be no more really and substantially different from God, than the Spirit or reasonable Part of Man is from Man, the Spirit must of Necessity be True God.

If then the Holy Ghost be True God, and consubstantial with the Father and Son, as has been proved from Authorities of greater Antiquity than *Origen* and *Eusebius*, it will follow that with the Father and Son he is *One God*. This is evident from the Premises; and may be more particularly discern'd by looking back on *Athenagoras's* Reasoning, p. 41. where, as he proves the Christians to be no Atheists, from their Confession of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, (which supposes each of them to be real God, in the Opinion of the Christians,) so does he take away the Suspicion of Polytheism, which he had been just arguing against, by asserting the Unity of the Three Persons; which, if it were an Unity of Consent, and not of Substance, would be no Argument; since such an Unity might well consist with the largest Polytheism; and notwithstanding their Profession of One God, they might still be found to be Worshippers of Many. See also p. 49. and 110. The same will appear from the former Citations out of *Tertullian* against *Praxeas*, to which I will add one or two more by way of Confirmation of this important Doctrine. Chap. 2. he affirms *Father*,

L

Son,

Son, and Holy Ghost to be of one Substance. Chap. 12. he declares himself to hold every where one Substance in three Persons united together; and Chap. 25. he acknowledges the Three Persons to be One with a substantial Unity.

The Authorities of these two Writers, for the Consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost, make it the more strange, that it should be asserted in the *Postscript*, p. 81. that no Christian ever heard of such a Doctrine or Language till long after the Council of Nice, when they both flourish'd a long time before it.

The same Author must excuse me, if I cannot have so mean an Opinion of the Argument (a) taken from 1 Cor. 12. for Trinity in Unity, as he (b) expresses; especially since some ancient and learned (c) Fathers, who may be supposed to have well thought on what they were doing, fall into the like Interpretation.

From what has been said of the Divinity of the Spirit, and its Unity with the Father and Son, will appear the Evidence of the Truth of St. Austin's Rule (d) that *as often as*

(a) *Considerations*, p. 13, 14, &c.

(b) *Postscript*, p. 99, 100.

(c) *Basil ad Amphil. Ambrosius, Hieronymus, Theodoritus.*

(d) *Lib. 6. de Trinit. cap. 9. Quoties in Scripturis Deus absolute & indefinite nominatur, tres simul divinas personas noties significari.*

God is absolutely and indefinitely named in Scripture, so often are the whole three Divine Persons understood together. Whosoever therefore God is worshipped in Scripture, the Holy Ghost must be worshipped also, as the third in the Trinity, comprehended under the Name *God*, and therefore must have had a daily Share of the Temple-Worship under the first *Economy*, which is a large and copious Proof of the Right of the Spirit to Divine Worship; and shews it was no childish Comment of the Antients, who understood the Term *Holy* to be thrice repeated (a) by the Seraphim, in Honour of the Trinity; which, tho' concealed from the *Jews*, and reserved for the Light of the Christian Dispensation, as *Tertullian* (b) tells us, yet cou'd not be unknown to the blessed Spirits, the constant Attendants of God's awful Throne. For 'tis certain both *Son* (c) and *Holy Ghost* (d) are said to have appeared and spoken in that Divine Person call'd *Lord of Hosts*, *Isai.* 6. 3. *Tertullian* seems plainly to include *Son* and *Holy Ghost* in the Name *Father*, in his *Explication of the Lord's Prayer*, c. 2. which being written before his Fall into *Montanism*, is an undoubted Proof of his Notions of the Divinity of the Spirit, and the Worship due to it, while he was yet Orthodox; (tho'

(a) *Mat. 6. 3.* (b) *Cap. 31. adv. Prax.* (c) *John 12. 41.*
(d) *Acts 28. 25, 26, 27.*

even after he became a *Montanist*, it doth not appear that he thence (a) departed from the Primitive and Catholick Faith;) and that the Rule of Faith was deliver'd to him in the very same Sense, in which he explain'd it afterwards in his Book against *Præreas*. This Author, in the above-cited Comment on the Lord's Prayer, having spoken of the Invocation of the Father, adds, (b) *the Son also is call'd upon in the Father*, founding it upon this Text, *I and my Father are one*, John 10. which is understood of a substantial Unity, *Lib. adv. Prax. c. 25.* and then subjoins, (c) *Neither is the Church our Mother neglected*, that is, in the Invocation. For the Mother is acknowledg'd in the Father and the Son, because it is owing to the Mother, that there is such Names as Father and Son. It is evident, that the Church, or Mother, invocated with Father and Son, cannot be the Body of the Saints Triumphant or Militant, for that wou'd introduce the Worship of the Creature. Neither can it be the Angels, for the same Reason. Since then it is distinct from Father and Son, and yet united with them as the Object of Worship, what can it be but the Holy Ghost? which may be properly called our Mother, because

(a) *Hist. of Mont. Art. II. § 7. XVI. § 7.*

(b) *Item in Patre Filius invocatur.*

(c) *Ne Mater quidem Ecclesia præteritur, siquidem in Filio ex Patre Mater recognoscitur, de qua constat Patris & Filii nomen.*

we are born of it, *John 3. 5, 6, 8.* or (a) from above, ver. 3, that is, of (b) *Jerusalem* which is above, and is the Mother of us all, *Gal. 4. 26.* In which Character of the *Heavenly Jerusalem*, the Holy Ghost seems to be mention'd, *Rev. 3. 12.* where, with the Name of the *Father* and *Son*, not that of the Holy Spirit, but of the *New Jerusalem*, as one with it, and the third in the Sacred Triad, is written upon the Victour. And it may further be observed, that in the apocalyptical Description of this City (c) *God* and the *Lamb* only, and not the *Spirit*, are said to be in it; the City it self being the Divine Spirit consider'd as it is the Rest of God and the Lamb. For so is the Holy Ghost called by *Syneſius* (d) *The Center, or Rest, of the Father: The Center of the Son, and also Mother.* Which latter Appellation is given to the *Spirit* by *Philo*, p. 165. who joins the Honour of the *Spirit* as our *Mother*, with that of *God* as our *Father*, as *Tertullian* does here. The Holy Ghost may be fitly called the *Church* also, as being the *Spirit* of the *Church*. For every one who is taken into the *Spirit*, is taken into the *Church*, and *vice versa*; it being a certain and ancient Truth, (e) *That*

(a) Ἀνωσερ. (b) Ἡ ἀνω Ἰερουσαλήμ.

(c) *Rev. 21. 22, 23. and 22. 1, 3.*

(d) Κέντρον γένεται. Κέντρον τοῦ κόρυ. Αυτὰ μάτη. *Hymnus quarto.*

(e) *Ubi enim Ecclesia, ibi est Spiritus Dei, & ubi Spiritus Dei, illic & Ecclesia.* *Iren. lib. 3. cap. 40.*

wheresoever there is the Church, there is the Spirit of God; and wherever there is the Spirit of God, there is the Church. Of this Divine Spirit, the Church, and our Mother, Christ is the Son, being conceived by the Holy Ghost in the Womb of the Virgin. It is true indeed, both *Hermas*, and *Tertullian* himself, *Lib. Panit. c. 10.* make the Church to be Christ; but there can be no Difficulty in this Matter, if we consider the Saying of *Iren. lib. 3. c. 40.* (a) *That the Holy Ghost is the Communication of Christ*, the Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, or from the Father thro' the Son; so that Christ, as communicated or going forth in the Holy Ghost, is the Church. The Object of our Worship being thus explain'd in the Manner above-mention'd, the Author makes the following Inference; (b) *Under therefore one Appellation [of Father] we honour God with His*, that is, with the Son and Holy Ghost, or the Church. For *His* is plural, and expresses more Persons than one, and therefore does not barely respect the Son, but something more than the Son; but nothing more can be join'd with Father and Son, according to the Doctrine of the Church, but the Holy Ghost; Therefore by *His* is meant Son and Holy Ghost; and the Church that is honour'd with Father and Son, must be the Holy

(a) *Communicatio Christi, id est, Spiritus Sanctus.*

(b) *Uno igitur genere aut vocabulo & Deum cum suis honoramus.*
Ghost.

Ghost. But to make it yet more clear, that the Worship of the Spirit is understood in this Prayer, as explain'd by *Tertullian*, I will consider a Passage or two out of Chap. 10. where speaking of the inward Qualification of Prayer, he says, (a) it ought to proceed from such a Spirit, as that is to which it is directed; and that you may know what the Spirit is to which it is directed, he adds, for a defiled Spirit cannot be regarded by the Holy Ghost; that is, the Spirit to which the Prayer is directed is the Holy Ghost; for therefore the Holy Ghost does not regard the Prayer of an unclean Spirit, because the Prayer is not directed to it by such a Spirit as it self is: For, adds he, (b) no one receives his Adversary, that is, the Holy Ghost cannot receive the Addresses of an unclean Spirit contrary to it; and (c) no one admits of any but his Compeer, that is, the Divine Spirit hearkens to none but a Spirit like it self.

Wee see then how little Truth there is in the Assertion of the *Postscript*, p. 102. that the Holy Ghost was never called God by the Ancients, nor was ever by them *invocated*; and how much to blame those learned Men are who grant it the *Arians*, and begin to

(a) *De tali Spiritu emissio, qualis est Spiritus ad quem mittitur; neque enim agnosci poterit a Spiritu Sancto Spiritus inquinatus.*

(b) *Nemo adversarium recipit.*

(c) *Nemo nisi comparem suum admittit.*

with that the prefent Church obliged to no such Denomination, or Invocation of him, as we are there told. And we may further obferve how unreasonable it is, as well as unbecoming the Modesty of a sober and Christian Enquirer, for the Author of the *Postscript* to tell us, p. 73. *that he can't but expect, that the Learned immediately yield up the Point of Invocation to the Holy Ghost, and to the whole Trinity, by way of Preparation to the Examination of the other.* What is this but to require us to put out our Eyes in order to see, or that it may be in the Power of others to lead us? Is not this to renounce the Light of the Spirit of Truth, our proper Guide in this important Controversy, and leave our selves open to the Spirit of Delusion, that comes of it self, without Invocation? 'Tis well, indeed, this first Step is advis'd towards a future Reformation, since I am much of Opinion, while the Divine Spirit has a Share in our Addresses, the Mind of the Scripture, by its Sacred Light, will be too well known to give any Countenance to the *Arian Principles*,

I shall sum up the whole of the Matter in the following Propositions, which I hope have been proved.

That the Name *Jehovah* is proper to the True God, and incommunicable to another.

That the Son being *Jehovah*, is therefore the True God.

That

That as such he is consubstantial with the Father, God by Nature, and One with him; and has the Attributes and Titles of the True God, such as Omnipotent, Eternal, Omniscent, &c.

That notwithstanding his Eternity, he was born, or came forth before the World, in order to create it.

That he assumed the constituent Parts of Man, a reasonable Soul, with its sensitive Faculties, and a Body of Flesh, to redeem Man.

That the Holy Ghost is True God, and substantially one with Father and Son.

That therefore he is, and ought to be, Invoked with them.

May the God of Truth, in Mercy, and not Judgment, discover it to those who have erred from it, that with one Mind, as well as one Heart, we may glorify and serve him, according to his unerring Revelation:

APPENDIX

[Numb. I.]

That the True God has an Incommunicable Name known to Men.

THIS is affirm'd by the Author of the Book of *Wisdom*, who uses these Words, Chap. 14. 22. *Men serving either Calamity or Tyranny, did ascribe unto Stones and Stocks the Incommunicable Name* (a). The only Difficulty is, which of God's Name is understood to be *Incommunicable*; For that it was a *known* Name, is evident from its being, given by Men to their Idols. I say, First, That the Author speaking in the Person of *Solomon*, must mean it of some *known* Name of God in the Times of the *Jewish* Dispensation. And that therefore, Secondly, It must either be meant of the supreme Name of God, *Jehovah*, or of some inferior Name us'd among the *Jews*. If of an inferior Name, then will it follow, that if such be incommunicable, much more the supreme Name of all: And it will be so far from being true, that no Name is incommunicable, that the contrary may be affirm'd of more than one. The Context, indeed, determines

(a) Τὸ αἰκονιώνιον ὄνομα.

it to be the Name (a) *God*, for says the Author of *Wisdom*, ver. 8. *That which is made with Hands is cursed, because being corruptible it was named God.* But since *God* is the Rendring of (b) *Jehovah*, as it is of *Elohim*, &c. and the Author refers to an *Hebrew* Name, as speaking in the Person of an *Hebrew*, and nothing certain can be concluded concerning the particular Name, the Opponent shall chuse which of the two he pleases, since either infers for an Incommunicable Name. Nay, tho' the Name *God* be consider'd without any Regard to its *Hebrew* Original; yet if *Irenaeus*'s (c) Remark be true, that none is call'd absolutely *God* in Scripture, either by Christ, or the Holy Ghost, or the Apostles, but *He who is the True and Only God*: And if Scripture be the Rule of our Use of the Divine Names, then it will follow that the Name *God* absolutely us'd is Incommunicable, or can be given to none, in an absolute Sense, but to the True God. But the Name *God* is given to Christ in an absolute Sense in the Holy Scripture. Therefore is Christ the True God.

But farther, the following Words are written in the Psalms, (d) *Thou whose Name alone is Jehovah, art the Most High, &c.* Here it is affirm'd of the True God, for to Him are the Words directed, that the Name

(a) Θεός. (b) *Isai.* 10. 26. *Heb.* & *LXXII.*
(c) *Lib.* 3. c. 6. 8. (d) *Psalm* 83. 18.

Jehovah belongs to him alone, which excluding all Others from a Right in the Name, makes it proper to the True God and, by Consequence, Incommunicable. But the Son is call'd by the Name *Jehovah*; therefore is He the True God, and the Most High; the Person whose Name is *Jehovah* being the Most High, that is, in Union with the Father. The LXXII indeed join the Term *Only* with *Most High*, and read, *Thou only art the Most High*. But the Jews, who pointed the Bible, refer it to the former Part of the Verse, which shews they look'd upon the Name *Jehovah* to be as Incommunicable as the *Septuagint* did the Name *Most High*. In which they are follow'd by the *Syriac*, which annexes it to the antecedent Sentence. This is confirm'd 2 *Kings* 19. 19, which speaks thus to the God of *Israel*, the One True God, *Thou art Jehovah Elohim alone*. If then the Name of *Jehovah Elohim* belong to the True God only, it must be incommunicable to any who is not the True God. But the Name *Jehovah Elohim* is given to Christ, as has been prov'd in the *Considerations*.* Therefore is He True God. It is said indeed, *Psalms* 86. 10. *Thou art God alone*. Where God or *Elohim* is pronounced to be as Incommunicable as *Jehovah Elohim*: But the Reason is, because it is understood here in an absolute and unrestrain'd Sense,

* See Page 19. Sect. 7. Append. p. 91. Num. 5.

in which, Irenaeus tells us, it is given to none but the True God; nor the Term *Yeho-vah*, tho' not express'd, may be supposed to have been join'd with it in the Mind of the Speaker. ~~and you shall see nothing like it as~~
~~soever else conceived or done by~~
~~any man since the creation of the world~~
~~to invest him [o Numb. 11.] with a~~
~~consideration that had not then been~~
~~supposed to be in the mind of any man~~
~~but him that had created him.~~
**The Divine and Pre-existing Humanity
 of C H R I S T.**

J O B 15. 7. *Art thou the first Man that
 was born?* ~~Hasichon Adham tivaledh,~~
~~Heb. מִן־אָדָם כִּי־בָּאָדָם־אָתָּה;~~ Sept.
*Wast thou born the First Man, or, the First
 of Men.* By the *First Man*, I understand the
 Divine Humanity, or Human Figure of the
Messiah, which he had before the World
 was. That there is such a Divine Humanity,
 and that it is understood here, I will endea-
 vor to prove from what follows.

First, That there is such a Thing as the
 Divine (or Heavenly) Humanity of the *Mes-
 siah*, existing before the Nature assumed of
 the Virgin, appears from *John 3. 13.* *No
 Man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that
 came down from Heaven, even the Son of
 Man which is in Heaven.* Where our Sa-
 viour affirms two Things of himself; First,
 That as *Son of Man*, he came down from
 Heaven; Secondly, That, as such, he was
 then

then in Heaven, when he was talking with Nicodemus on Earth; except the latter Part of the Verse should be rather translated, the Son of Man which was in Heaven. But be that as it will, neither the latter nor former Rendering, nor, by Consequence, the whole Verse, can be understood of the Nature taken of the Virgin, which was not in Heaven till our Saviour's Ascension, nor had its Existence till its Birth in that blessed Womb: So that it could neither be said to be in Heaven before it ascended, nor to have come down from Heaven before it had its Being. It must then be understood of a Divine Humanity.

And this may be further proved, or confirmed, from John 6. 53. Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you. This Flesh is called Bread, ver. 51. And the Bread, which I will give, is my Flesh. And this Bread is said to come down from Heaven, ver. 50. This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven; and ver. 51. I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven. Therefore the Flesh of the Son of Man, and, by Consequence, the Son of Man himself, came down from Heaven, and therefore existed as such before the Incarnation.

But Persons, perhaps, may be enquiring how this Divine Humanity can be call'd the Son of Man, since it is not begotten of Man? I answer, It is so by way of Similitude, because

cause it bears the Figure after which Man was formed.

Secondly, The Pre-existence of the *Messiah*, as Man, appears from the Manifestations which he gave of himself, in Old Time, under that Figure. Such were those made to *Abraham*, Gen. 18. and to *Joshua*, Chap. 5. 13, 14, 15. and Chap. 6. 2. and such was that of the Glory of the *Mercavah*, *Ezak.* 1. 26. Which Human Figure of the *Messiah*, may, with more Reason, be suppos'd to be constant and fix'd to his Person, than to be taken up occasionally, because it was fit that He, who was the Head of Mankind, should bear the Form of those who were so nearly related to him. But all this don't yet prove that the *First Man* of *Job* is this Heavenly Humanity, which I shew from the following Words of the Verse, *And wast thou made before the Hills?* *Veliphei ghebbagbnoth bholalta*; to be born before the Hills, is to have Being, while as yet God had not made the Earth, nor the Fields, nor the biggest Part of the Dust of the World, *Prov.* 8. 25, 26. Now *Adam*, who was formed after the Earth, cannot be the *First Man*, who was brought forth before it; but the Text, by denying *Job* to be that Man, supposes there is such a one: Who then can that *First Man* be but the *Messiah*, in relation to his Divine Manhood? who, speaking of himself in the Person of Wisdom, says, *Before the Hills was I brought forth,*

forth, Lipnei ghebhagh noth hiolalti, Prov. 8. 25. which are the very Words of Job apply'd to the *First Man*, with only a Change of the Second to the First Person: The *First Man* then, and the Divine Wisdom, or *Messiah*, are all one.

I will proceed to the next Verse, *Hast thou heard the Secret of God?* The Septuagint add to it, Μη οπόσεας οὐδὲ προστρέπε οὐδὲ οὐδὲ, *Did God use thee as a Counsellor?* God's Secret is indeed with the *Righteous*, Prov. 3. 30. but none of them was in the Secret of the Creation, none of them was his Counsellor, but the filial Wisdom, which was then by him, as one brought up with him, Prov. 8. 30. with whom He took Counsel about the Creating of Man, Gen. 1. 26. and who, by way of Eminence, is called *Counsellor*, Isai. 9. 6. πορεύεται δύσκολος, Sept. *the Angel of great Counsel.* But as for Man, it is deny'd of them all, Isai. 40. 13. Rom. 11. 34. The *First Man* then, who heard the *Secret of God*, or was his Counsellor, must be the *Messiah*.

And dost, or didst, thou restrain Wisdom to thy self? Veti ghragh, *Heb.* Didst thou diminish or contract her? The infinite and incomprehensible Wisdom of God is, as it were, circumscribed and brought into little in the Person of Christ, that it might converse with the finite Creature, and be comprehended by him according to the Extent of his Capacity.

pacity. In this Miniature, as I may so call it, are comprehended or *bid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge*, which Man's Understanding is ever capable of receiving, all Things beyond it being too vast and overflowing to bear any Proportion to its limited Faculties. It appears then, from these three Reasons already mention'd, that the *First Man* must be the *Messiah*; First, Because *He was brought forth before the Hills*; Secondly, Because He was God's Counsellor at the Beginning of the World; Thirdly, Because infinite Wisdom confined and limited it self in Him, that it might be capable of being known and enjoy'd by the intellectual Creature. The Interrogatories put to *Job*, shew He was not this wonderful Person, but plainly suppose that there was such a one.

[Numb. III.]

The same Pre-existence proved from the Existence of the Mercavah before the World.

PSALM xciii. 2.

THY Throne is establish'd of Old, or from Then, Thou art from Everlasting. In these Words I will consider, First, What is meant by the Terms Of Old, or From Then; Secondly

condly, What the *Throne* is, that was *estab-*
lished of Old, or *from Then*. Thirdly,
 Whose the Throne is that is so establish'd,
 or who the *Person* is that is *from Everlasting*.

First, By the Terms *Of Old*, or, *From Then*, is meant before the Foundations of the World, as is evident from the Words of Wisdom, *Prov. 8. 22.* who expresses her Subsistence before the World in the very same Terms, saying, *The Lord possessed me in the Beginning of his Way, before his Works of Old*, or, *from Then*.

Secondly, *The Throne that was establish'd from Then*, or, before the Foundations of the World, is the Cherubick Throne describ'd *Ezek. Chap. 1.* and which *Job* supposes, *Chap. 26.* to have subsisted from the Beginning of the World: For having spoken, ver. 8. of the Second Day's Creation, when the Waters were divided by the Firmament, or Heaven, and the Clouds made, he adds, ver. 9. *He holdeth back the Face of his Throne, and spreadeth his Cloud upon it*; teaching us that the Clouds, in the Day of their Creation, were made use of for a Vail to the Divine Throne, which supposes the Subsistence of the Throne, and the Nakedness of the Glory, before it was vail'd by them. *Ezekiel*, in his Description of the *Mercavah*, *Chap. 1.* mentions the Cloud encompassing the Throne, ver. 4. For that the same Throne is understood in both Places, is evident from hence,

hence, that God has manifested Himself in the Old and New Testament on no other original Throne, than this one of the Cherubims, which is the Heaven mention'd *Isaiah 66. 1.* *The Heaven is my Throne*, as will appear by comparing it with *Ezek. I. 22, 23, 26.* where the Firmament, or *Heaven*, is said to be stretch'd o'er the Heads of the Cherubim, and the Likeness of a *Throne* above the Firmament; and with *Exodus 24. 10.* which tells us, *that under the Feet of the God of Israel, there were, as it were, the Body of Heaven in Clearness.*

This Subsistence of the Cherubick Throne before the World, is farther prov'd from that of the Angels. For if these were Witnesses of the Creation of the World, and prais'd God for it, as *Job* tells us they did, *Chap. 38. 7.* saying, that *the Morning Stars sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for Joy, when the Corner-Stone of the Earth was made*, then did they subsist before the Creation; and, by Consequence, the *Cherubim*, one of their Orders, and the *Thrones*, another, *Colos. I. 16.* And if the *Cherubim* and *Thrones*, then we need not doubt but the *Mercavah*, consisting of them: No Place of Scripture giving us any Ground to imagine, that they were appointed to this Office after the lower Creation, or any Part of it.

Thirdly, The Being, whose *Throne* is from *then*, and Himself from *Everlasting*, is *Jehovab,*

vab, as appears from Verse 1. *The Lord, or, Jebovab, reigneth.* But not *Jebovab*, as consider'd in his Infinite and Incomprehensible Essence. For how cou'd a Finite Creature, such as the Cherubick Throne, receive an Infinite and Incomprehensible Being? but as manifested in a Limited and Comprehensible Figure, proportion'd to the Capacity of the Throne, and the Intellectual Creation, that were to receive and enjoy Him.

This Limited and Visible Figure was that of a Man, in which, and no other, he is recorded to have appear'd on the Sacred *Mer-cavab*. For thus speaks *Ezekiel* concerning it, Chap. 1. Ver. 26. *Upon the Likeness of the Throne was the Likeness as the Appearance of a Man above upon it*; and Verse 27. *From the Appearance of his Loins even upward, and from the Appearance of his Loins even downward.* With which compare *Exod. 24. 10. Dan. 7. 9.*

If then the Throne was before the World, and was made to receive *Jebovab*, as manifested in the Likeness of a Man, then may it be inferr'd that this Humane Figure had a real Subsistence before the World: Since it is more reasonable to suppose that this Divine Form shou'd subsist before the Throne, as the First Fruits of the Creation, than the Throne before the Form that was to sit on it. For can we think that a Cloud was cast about the Throne on the Second Day's Creation,

tion, for any other End than to veil the Glory of the Humane Likeness that rested upon it? Especially, since it is evident, that when the Glory separated it self from the Sacred *Mercavah*, the Cloud follow'd it, as the proper Vail of Divine Majesty, *Ezek. 10. 4.* which has declared that *it wou'd dwell in the thick Darkness*, *1 Kings 8. 12.*

But it may be further prov'd from the latter Part of the second Verse, *Thou art from Everlasting*. Where, from *Everlasting*, is of the same Import with *from Then*, or, *of Old*, with which it is join'd, *Prov. 8. 22, 23.* *And Then* stands for *Jehovah*, as related to his Throne, *which is establish'd of old*, that is, as manifested in a Humane Figure on the Throne of the *Mercavah*: For the Meaning of the whole Verse seems to be this, *Thy Throne, O Lord, and thy Glory, which overshadows it, are Both from Everlasting*. But the Glory overshadowing it was Finite, and in a Humane Likeness, as has been above prov'd. Therefore the Glory of *Jehovah* in a Humane Likeness was *from Everlasting*, or before the World was.

The only remaining Difficulty is, which of the Divine Persons it was that more particularly manifested Himself in this Humane Appearance? And I think it may, with great Freedom and Truth, be affirm'd to be the Son, who being appointed by the Father to be the Head of Mankind, and the great Original,

nal, in whose Image and Likeness all of them were to be made, it is no wonder He should appear to them from the Beginning in their own Figure. It will follow then from the Premises, that the Son subsisted from the Beginning in the Humane Likeness; or was *brought forth* into the Figure of a Man before the World, to be the Head and Monarch of Intellectual Beings. For so the Psalm begins, *The Lord is King*, and is, according to the *Septuagint*, a Psalm of Praise to the Great God for the Works of the Creation.

This Doctrine of the Son's Pre-existence, as the First Man, and King of Men, confirms my Remarks on *Job* 15. 7. and explains the true Meaning of *Prov.* 8. 23. *I was set up from Everlasting*, that is, appointed to be King from Everlasting. For that the Term *Nissachti*, *I was set up*, contains in its Meaning a Notion of Superiority or Government, is evident from the derivative Word *Nesiiche*, which stands for Princes, *Ezek.* 32. 30. and elsewhere. The same Verb is join'd also in *Kal* with the Term *King*, *Psalms* 2. 6. *have I set my King*, which the *Septuagint* read in *Niphal*, and render, (a) *I am appointed King*.

So that I can hardly doubt but the comparing of this Place with *Prov.* 8. 23. deter-

(a) Ἐγώ ἐγειραντος βασιλέως.

min'd

inin'd *Eusebius*, in his Ecclesiastical (a) Theology, to understand the Creation of *Wisdom*, not of her absolute Beginning to Exist, but of her being appointed to Govern the Universe. For he makes use of the *Septuagint* Term to express his Meaning, explaining the Words *He (b) Created me*, by *He (c) Appointed me*; and the whole Sentence, *He Created me the Beginning of his Way*, by, *He Appointed me to Govern his Works (d)*.

All which Observations put together, will, I believe, be a strong Argument, that *Prov. 8. 22.* is not to be understood, as the *Arians* would have it, of the First and Absolute Generation of the Son, but of his being Appointed to be King on the Cherubick Throne, in the limited and visible Figure of a Man.

(a) *Lib. 3.*

(b) *Extract.*

(c) *Katéchon.*

(d) See the small Extract out of *Euseb. Eccles. Theol.*

[*Numb. IV.*]

A short Extract out of Eusebius de Eccles. Theol. Lib. 3. concerning the Creation of Wisdom.

THIS Author affirms, (e) that *Wisdom*, mention'd *Prov. 8.* is the same with the *Word*; and (f) that the Expression, *The*

(e) *Page 149. Edit. Paris. 1628.*

(f) *Page 150. Lord*

Lord created me the Beginning of his Ways,
 Verse 22. is not to be understood, as if
Wisdom, or the Word, proceeded out of No-
thing into Being, but that the Word, which
was already in a living and subsisting Essence,
and existing before the World, was appointed
by God to govern all Things, the Term
Creating meaning no more than (a) Ordain-
ing and Appointing. From which the fol-
lowing Observations may be made. First,
That the Author excludes from Creating, the
proper Meaning, of Producing Something
out of Nothing. Secondly, That by being
Created to be the (b) Beginning, he means,
(c) being Appointed to Govern. Thirdly,
That the Word Existed before it was Ap-
pointed to Govern, or, Created to be the Be-
ginning of God's Ways.

He proceeds (d) to give several Instances,
 in which (e) Creating is not us'd *Absolu-*
tely for giving Being to a Thing not already
 subsisting, but *Relatively*, for (f) *Sending,*
Appointing, and Reforming, &c. a Thing al-
 ready subsisting; And therefore says we ought
 not to wonder, if it be us'd in the like meta-
 phorical Sense, in the Words, *He Created me*
the Beginning, &c.

(a) Κατέταξεν ἢ κατέσησεν.

(b) Τὸν ἀρχὴν.

(c) Ἀρχεῖν τὸν, ὅλων τελευτὴν.

(d) Page 151.

(e) Κτίσω.

(f) Καταπέμπων, ἢ κατεπεινων.

He (a) repeats the same Interpretation, that *Creating Her the Beginning of his Ways*, is *Appointing Her to Govern his Works*: That it is not said simply *He Created Her*, but with a Restriction, or relatively, to be the *Beginning of his Ways*. He tells us that the *Hebrew* signifies *He Possessed me*, as it is render'd by *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion*; and that the Father having begotten the Son, *Appointed Him to be the Saviour and Head of all Things*, or to sum up all Things in Himself. In which Words, he affirms the Son to have been Begotten or Born of the Father before He was *Created* or Appointed to be the *Head or Beginning of all Things*.

He asserts the same again, (b) saying, that the Father who Begat him, *Appointed Him to Govern All Things* for this very Purpose, that He might Preside o'er *his Ways*; and tells us, that the *Hebrew* Word *Kana* is render'd unanimously by all other Interpreters besides the *Septuagint*, by the Word *Possess'd*; That *Created* is rejected by the *Jews*, as not answering the Original; That *Creating*, in its common Use, signifies the Coming forth of Something out of Nothing; and *Possessing*, the proper Relation of a pre-existing Thing to him who possesses it: And that therefore, when the Son of God said of Himself, *The*

Lord Created or Possess'd me the Beginning, &c. he taught, First, His Pre-existence to that Possession or Creation; Secondly, His proper Relation to the Father Possessing Him; Thirdly, The Necessity of his Providence for Governing the Works that were made by his Father. From this Explication, it follows, that *Eusebius* either never urg'd the above-cited Text taken out of *Prov. 8, 22.* in his former Works for the First and Absolute Generation of the Son: Or, if he did, that he had chang'd his Mind in this latter Treatise written against *Marcellus.*

This Stile of Writing us'd by *Eusebius*, is found in *Athanasius's* (a) second Oration; where he gives us, First, Several Instances of the Use of the Word *Create*, (b) Κτίζω; and most of them the very same with those of *Eusebius* (c), and in the same Order. Secondly, He understands it not of an *Absolute Creation* of Wisdom, but a *Relative*, as She is (d) *the Beginning of God's Ways*, as is also held by *Eusebius* (e). Thirdly, He makes *εὐτάξει*, *He Created*, to be of the same Import with *κατέτινετο*, (f) *He Appointed*, as *Eusebius* does (g). The Difference between them is this, that *Eusebius* understands it of Christ, as *He is the Beginning of the Works of the*

(a) *Orat. secunda cont. Arianos.*(b) *Sect. 46.*(c) *Page 151.*(d) *Sect. 52, 53.*(e) *Page 152.*(f) *Sect. 53.*(g) *Page 151.*

Creation, which is undoubtedly its first Meaning; but *Athanasius*, of Christ in relation to his Incarnation, or as He is the *Beginning* of the New Creation, which may be truly its second Meaning: For it is certain that the Terms *ἀρχὴ* and *ωραῖος*, spoken of Christ by (a) *Solomon* and (b) *St. Paul*, as the Beginning of the Creation, are apply'd to Him by the (c) latter, as the Beginning of Man's Redemption, by his Resurrection from the Dead. *Eusebius*, indeed, falls upon *Marcellus* for this second Meaning put upon the Term *Creation*: But I suppose it was because he held it in Opposition to, and exclusive of, the first Meaning intended by *Solomon*.

As for the Import of the Term (d) *Beginning*, us'd in the *Proverbs*, *Theoph.* ad *Autol.* tells us, (e) that *Christ* is call'd the Beginning, because He is the Prince and Lord of all Things made by Him. And *Dionysius of Rome* explains, (f) *He Created me, by, He put me over the Works made by Him*. Both which fall in with *Eusebius*'s Interpretation, who, for *Created me*, uses (g) *Appointed me, ἀνέτισεν*, as *Dionysius* does *ἐπέτισεν*,

(a) *Prov. 8. 22.*(b) *Coloss. 1. 15.*(c) *Verse 18.*(d) *Ἄρχη.*

(e) Οὐτοῦ λέγεται ἀρχὴ, ὅτι ἀρχεῖ καὶ κυριεῖ πάντων τοῦτον δι' αὐτοῦ δεδημιουργημένων.

(f) Ἐκποτε, ἐπέτισε τοῖς τοῦτον αὐτοῦ ληγόσιν ἔργοις. *Athan. de Decret. Nic. Synod.* §. 26.(g) *Eccles. Theol. p. 151.*

He put me over; and explains the Term *Beginning* by the following Paraphrase, (a) *To Rule over all Things*, as *Theopb.* does by (b) *being Prince and Lord of all Things*.

(a) Ἀρχεῖν τῷ οἰκου. (b) Ἀρχεῖν τῷ κυρίῳ πάντων.

[Numb. V.]

The Doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as taught by Origen in his Book against Celsus.

THIS Father tells us, (a) that *Celsus* supposing the Christians to hold that *God Himself, or the Father, descended to Men*, thought it was a Consequence of their Opinion, *that He must leave his Throne*. To take off which Objection, *Origen* answers, that *Celsus knew not the (b) Power of God, and that the (c) Spirit of the Lord fills the World, and that which contains all Things, has Knowledge of the Voice*. In which, as He makes the *Power of God, and the Spirit of the Lord*, to be one, so does He infer the Omnipresence of God from that of his Spirit, which supposes either the Unity of Both in one Substance, or two Omnipre-

(a) Lib. 4. p. 164. (b) Διωράμεν Θεός.
(c) Wisd. 1. 7. Κυρίος πνεῦμα.

sents

sents substantially distinct, which is impossible. For that the *Holy Ghost* is understood by *the Spirit of the Lord*, is evident from Verse 5. of the same Chapter, where it is call'd *the Holy Spirit of Discipline*, it being no strange Thing in the Writer of that Book to make *Wisdom* stand sometimes for both the *Word* and the *Spirit*; sometimes for the *Spirit*, in Distinction from the *Word*, as Chap. 9. where having said, ver. 1. *that God made all Things with his Word*, he subjoins, ver. 2. *that He ordain'd Man thro' his Wisdom*; which Term *Wisdom* is explain'd ver. 17. *by the Holy Ghost*, as it is Chap. 1. ver. 5. compar'd with ver. 4, 6. In which Stile of Writing He is follow'd by *Theopb. ad Autol.* (a) and by *Irenæus* and *Origen*, as cited in the Notes; who use *Word* and *Wisdom* for the Second and Third Persons of the Sacred Trinity.

But to return to *Origen*, having prov'd the Omnipresence of God from the Omnipresence of the *Power* and *Spirit* of God, he proceeds to tell his Adversary, that *the (b) Power and Divinity of God* passes thro', and enters into whatsoever it pleases, and wheresoever there is Room for it; and this without *deserting* one Place and *filling* another. That if God be said at any time to *Desert* or *Fill*,

(a) Page 106.

(b) Ἐπιδημεῖ δὲ δύναμις καὶ Θεῖνς Θεός. See Page 231.

it is only such Souls as are fitted to be fill'd with the (a) Divine Spirit, or to be (b) deserted of God. In which Words we may observe, First, That the *Power and Divinity of God* fills all Things; Secondly, That God fills the Souls of the Righteous; Thirdly, That God's Filling the Souls of the Righteous, is their being full of the *Divine Spirit*, or *Holy Ghost*. From whence, I think it is clear, that the *Power and Divinity of God, God, and the Divine Spirit*, are Terms that are us'd by this Father to express one and the same Divine Nature: Which is further confirm'd, by his Manner of Speaking in the next Page, where he cites *Wisd. 7. 27.* *That in all Ages (c) the Wisdom of God, entering into Holy Souls, maketh them Friends of God and Prophets*; adding, that we may learn from Scripture, that Saints of ev'ry Age have receiv'd (d) the *Divine Spirit*, and that some Prophets have been more eminent than others in receiving (e) the *Godhead*: In which the Wisdom that enters into Holy Souls, is the *Divine Spirit* receiv'd by the Saints, and the *Godhead* by the Prophets. Which is a clear Assertion that the *Holy Ghost is God*.

(a) Θεος πνευματι.

(b) Την τε θεον.

(c) Η σοφια τε θεος.

(d) Τε θεος πνευματι.

(e) Την θεοτητι.

See p. 231.

Lib. 6. (a) *Origen* blames *Plato* for personating *Jupiter* in his *Timaeus*, and making a Speech in his Name, and refers them to the true and real Words of God in the Prophetick Scriptures, telling them, (b) that the Characteristick of a God speaking, is Foretelling Things to come; (c) And that it was the Divine Spirit that foretold those Things. If then the Divine Spirit Foretells Things, and Foretelling be an Argument of a God, the Divine Spirit must be God. Which is the very Reason the Father and Son make use of to prove that they are He, or the True God, *Isai.* xlvi. 9, 10, 12. xliv. 7, 8. *John* xiii. 19.

He tells us, (d) that God does not partake of Essence, but is rather partaken than partakes of, and is partaken of by them who have the Spirit of God. Here it is evident, that having the Spirit is Partaking of God: Which wou'd induce one to believe, that the Author look'd upon the Spirit to be God. For I can remeinder nothing in this whole Treatise, that makes it a bare Medium of Communication, and not it Self God.

He says (e), it is a difficult Thing to know the Spirit by Contemplation, as it is

(a) Page 281.

(b) Τὸν δὲ χαρακτηρίζον τὸ θεότητα, οὐ τοῖς μελλόντων δέν
ἀπαγγελίᾳ.

(c) Ὡς θεού Πνεύμα ἦν τὸ τοῦτο ἀπαγγέλλον.

(d) Page 319. (e) Page 323.

to know the Father and Son. For, says he, (a) *Let it be granted that it is a difficult Thing to Contemplate God, yet is not He the only one whom it is difficult to Contemplate, but his only begotten Son also :* (b) *For it is difficult to Contemplate God the Word, and also difficult to Contemplate Wisdom, or the Holy Ghost, by whom God made all Things.* Where the Difficulty of Contemplating the Three Persons is affirm'd of all in the very same Term without any Distinction, which looks as if he did not think the Spirit at so wide a Distance from God the Father, as a Creature from its Creator.

A little after, he affirms the Spirit to be Indivisible or Inseparable from God, saying, *God always communicates his own Spirit, which is call'd before the Spirit of God, to those who are capable of receiving it, but not by (c) Abscission or Division.* Which Manner of Speaking supposes that the Spirit comes forth from God, and is no Creature. For if it be a Creature made out of Nothing, to what Purpose was the Caution given, that we shou'd not think it cut off or divided from God ? since the very Notion of coming out of Nothing excludes that Conception.

(a) Ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ αὐτοτελῆ Θεός ὁ θεός, &c.

(b) Δυστελῆ Θεός ἐστιν ὁ θεός λόγος, αὐτοτελῆ Θεός δὲ εἶπον
καὶ σοσια δέσποιν, εἰς δὲ τὰ πάντα πεποίκητον ὁ θεός.

(c) Οὐ κατὰ ἀποτομὴν καὶ διστίρεον.

If then the Spirit come forth from God without Separation, and is no Creature, (and there is no Medium of Negation, that we know of, between God and the Creature,) then must the Spirit be one with God. Which will be further prov'd from the following Reasoning; For therefore does he justify his Assertion, That the Spirit is communicated without Division, because the (a) Spirit is not a Body, which Spirit he calls God (b), saying, *As we don't conceive God to be a Body, when He is called a Spirit: (c) So neither do we say He is a Body, when He is called a Spirit.* To which Spirit, or God, as He is the Spirit, does he apply those Words of our Saviour, (d) *God is a Spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in Spirit and Truth.* And the Words of the Apostle, with some Variation, (e) *Whensoever we shall turn to the Lord (for the Lord is the Spirit) the Vail shall be taken away.* And having thus asserted God, as He is the Spirit, to be not a Body, he infers, that Celsus was greatly ignorant of the Spirit of God, when he imagin'd the Christians to believe that God was no otherwise a Spirit than the Stoicks held Him, that is, a Corporeal one.

(a) οὐδὲ γέ σῶμα τὸ — πνεῦμα.

(b) Page 324.

(c) οὐτως εἰν λέγον πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός, οὐ σῶμα δυτὶ πνεῦμα εἰ.

(d) John 4. 24.

(e) 2 Cor. 3. 16, 17.

From whence it is evident, that the same Spirit affirm'd to be *not a Body* in the Premises, is affirm'd to be Incorporeal in the Conclusion, which is no other than an Application of the Doctrine of the Premises, in Opposition to the Charge of *Celsus*, imagining the Christian to believe that the Spirit was a Body. But the Spirit affirm'd to be Incorporeal in the Premises, is God himself, and, in the Conclusion, the Holy Ghost: Therefore God, as He is the Spirit, and the Holy Ghost, are Both One. For if the same Spirit is not understood in the Premises and Conclusion, the Proving God, as He is a Spirit, to be Incorporeal in the Premises, wou'd never infer the Spirit of God, or Holy Ghost, to be Incorporeal in the Conclusion. But *Origen* infer the Incorporeity of the Holy Ghost, from the Incorporeity of God, as He is a Spirit. Therefore he look'd upon the Holy Ghost, and God, as He is a Spirit, to be One.

This Spirit, he affirms, is to be worship'd in the following Words, (a) *Neither is the Spirit to be worship'd in Types*. Therefore is the Holy Ghost no less than God himself, the Object of Worship.

Lib. 7. (b) he says, That a Person acted by the Divine Spirit should be sooner benefited by his own Prophecies, and have a greater

(a) Ἀλλὰ γὰρ εἰ τόπος ἀργούντεν δεῖ τῷ μηδιμνᾷ.

(b) Page 333.

Discernment, when (a) the Deity is upon Him, than any Person who is intrusted by Him. Where it is evident, that the Deity present with the Prophet in the Inspiration, is the *Holy Ghost* acting Him. Therefore the *Holy Ghost* is God.

Lastly, The Doctrine of the same Father, Lib. 2. * infers the *Holy Ghost* to be God and Lord. For he affirms, that in Peter's Vision of the Beasts and Birds, it was the *Spirit of Truth*, or *Holy Ghost*, as he calls it before, that said to Peter, (b) *Arise Peter, Kill and Eat.* As may be confirm'd from ver. 19. which teaches us, that while Peter thought on the Vision, the Spirit said unto him, &c. So that if the Spirit spoke here, it may well be suppos'd, according to Origen, to have spoken before. To the Spirit thus speaking to him, and bidding him, *Rise, Kill, and Eat*, Peter answers, (c) *Not so Lord*, calling the Spirit, whom doubtless he knew to be the *Holy Ghost*, by the Name *Lord*.

But this is not all. In his Speech to *Cornelius*, (d) he tells him, that God had shew'd him, that he shou'd not call any Man common or unclean. Now the Person, who had shew'd him this Truth, was the *Holy Ghost*; whose Voice it was that said to him, (e) *What God hath cleans'd, that call not thou common*.

(a) Τὸ θεῖον.
(c) Ver. 14.

* Page 58.
(d) Ver. 28.

(b) Acts 10. 13.
(e) Ver. 28,

being the same Voice that said, *Rise, Kill, and Eat.* The *Holy Ghost* then is both *God* and *Lord.*

This important Truth is confirm'd by the same Apostle *Peter*, in his Speech in the Council at *Jerusalem*, where he uses these Words, (a) *Ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my Mouth should hear the Word of the Gospel.* But the Person who made choice of *Peter*, was the *Holy Ghost*, according to Chapter 10. Verses 19, 20. where we are taught, that *the Spirit said to Peter, Behold, three Men seek thee. Arise therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing: for I have sent them.* Which imports, that *Cornelius's* Visions and Instructions, no less than *Peter's*, were from the *Holy Ghost*. Therefore the *God* who made choice of, and sent, *Peter* to preach to the *Gentiles*, was the *Holy Ghost*.

It is worth while to consider that Expression of the Spirit, *For I have sent them.* Which is the Stile of a free and principal Agent, and not of one barely commission'd to deliver a Message.

The Sum of *Origen's* Doctrine of the *Holy Ghost* is this, that it is *Omnipresent, Foreknowing, Inseparable from God, and it Self God.* Which being Attributes and Names

too great for a Creature, argue that *Origen* either never asserted the Spirit to be a Creature, and that his Commentary on *St. John* is interpolated; or, if not, that he had changed his Mind in this latter Treatise.

[Numb. VI.]

An Argument for the Divinity and Worship of the Holy Ghost, from the Practice of the first Christian Prophets, and infallibly Inspired Teachers.

Act s xiii. 1 — 5.

Now there were in the Church, that was at Antioch, certain Prophets and Teachers. — As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, * Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the Work whereunto I have called them. So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, &c.

THE Persons ministering were Prophets and Teachers: By Prophets, I don't barely understand those that foretell Things to come, but (a) who speak unto Men to Edi-

* *Apocleate ση μοι.*

(a) 1 *Corinth.* 14: 3, 22, 24, 29, 31, 32.

fication,

ification, and Exhortation, and Comfort. In which Sense they are properly join'd with Teachers: And by being appointed to the Instruction of others, were probably, for their greater Influence and Authority, of the Order of Presbyters; as may be further gather'd from the Import of the Word (a) *ministring*, which when made use of to express an immediate Service to God, as in this Place, is appropriated, by the *Septuagint*, to the *Priests* and *Levites*; neither do I know any Place, that contradicts this Observation, substituting only in the New Testament the Christian Priests and Deacons, in the Place of the Jewish Priests and *Levites*.

After the Persons *ministring*, I shall enquire into the Meaning of the *Act* of *separating*, enjoin'd them by the Spirit: Which I take to be a Liturgical Word borrow'd from the Old Testament, and signifies *Waving*, in which Sense it is us'd in relation to Persons, as it is here, *Numb. 8. 11.* which, according to the *Hebrew*, runs thus; *And Aaron shall wave the Levites before the Lord, a Wave-offering from the Children of Israel, that they may be to serve the Service of the Lord.* But, according to the Words of the *Septuagint*, thus, (b) *Aaron shall separate the Levites* a

(a) Λειτουργούστων δὲ αὐτῶν.

(b) Καὶ αφοεῖται Ἀαρὼν τοὺς Λειτας ψώδημα ἔναντι Κυρίου τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐν Ιερῷ. καὶ ἔστιν αὐτοῖς ἐργαζεῖσθαι τὰ ἔργα Κυρίου.

Gift before the Lord from the Children of Israel, and they shall be to work the Works of the Lord. Now the Precept being given in the *Acts* to the Presbyters of the Church, to separate *Barnabas* and *Saul*, as it was here given to the High-Priest to separate the *Levites*, it may fairly be infer'd that the same Thing is meant in both Places, namely, the *Act of Waving*.

The next Thing to be consider'd, is the Person to whom the *Act of Waving* was perform'd in the Old Testament, and to whom it was commanded to be paid in this Place of the New. The *Person* in the Old Testament, to whom it was perform'd, was *Jehovah*, the God of the *Jews*, and no other, it being a solemn *Act of the Temple Worship*, and therefore due to Him alone, who was the *Object* of it. For which Reason it must be proper to him in the New. For if the typical *Waving* cou'd be given to none but to *Jehovah*, we cannot believe that the real and spiritual kind of *Worship* prefigur'd by it, cou'd be given to any inferior Being; for this wou'd be to put the *Antitypes*, or *Substance*, in a worse Condition than the *Types* or *Shadows*. But the *Holy Ghost* is the *Person*, or *Object*, to whom this *Evangelical Waving* or *Separation* is commanded to be perform'd; for says the *Holy Ghost*, (a) *Separate or wave to me Barnabas and Saul*; as the *Lord* said to *Moses*, (b) *Thou*

(a) ἀποικοῦσθι μοι.

(b) *Numb. 8. 13. Heb.*

shalt

that wave the Levites a Wave-offering to the Lord. Therefore will it follow, if the Object of Waving in the New Covenant cannot be inferior to that of the Old, the Holy Ghost must be Jehovah, the True God, and the Object of our Worship, Wave being an Act of Worship : And if the Object of this Sort of Worship, we need not doubt of all other ; for Waving is such a solemn Act of Offering up a Person to the True God, as entirely separates him for his Service, as is evident from Numb. 8. 11. *Aaron shall separate the Levites — to work the Works of the Lord ; and from Acts, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the Work wherunto I have called them.* Which great Likeness of Style, further Evidence of the Likeness of Sense in both Places. If then the whole Man is offered up to the Divine Spirit in the Act of Wave, or Separating, and no greater Act of Worship can be paid than such an entire and unrevered Oblation, can any Part of Divine Worship be deny'd to that Spirit, to whom the whole Man is entirely offer'd ? Who the Spirit shews it self also to be a Supream Agent by that authoritative Expression, *wherunto I have called them* ; not inferior to the Work of Jehovah, in his free and absolute Choice of the Levites, Numb. 8. 16. 18. *I have taken them unto Me.*

6 AP 58

F I N. I. S.